National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r.86/06)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

HOME SEWING: SATISFACTION WITH SEWING AS A HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTION ACTIVITY

by

DIANE L. BLENKARN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

CLOTHING AND TEXTILES

FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-30252-6

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR DIANE L. BLENKARN

TITLE OF THESIS HOME SEWING: SATISFACTION WITH SEWING AS A HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTION ACTIVITY

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF SCIENCE

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED SPRING 1986

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) .....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

.....1603 Galbraith, Michener Park.....

.....Edmonton, Alberta.....

.....T6H 5B5.....

DATED .....February 10.....19 86

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled HOME SEWING: SATISFACTION WITH SEWING AS A HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTION ACTIVITY submitted by DIANE L. BLENKARN in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE in CLOTHING AND TEXTILES.

N. Fetterman

Supervisor

Joan Le Labar

Doris R. Badir

Date February 10, 1986

ABSTRACT

Home Sewing: Satisfaction with Sewing as a Household Production Activity

by

Diane L. Blenkarn

University of Alberta, 1986

Professor: Dr. Nelma I. Fetterman

Faculty: Home Economics

Department: Clothing and Textiles

The purpose of the study was to investigate what characteristics differentiate home sewers who define sewing as a household activity from those who define it as a leisure activity. In order to assess differences in characteristics, home sewing as housework and as a leisure activity was investigated and respondents stated their perception of sewing as housework, leisure activity, a combination or something else.

The Home Production Activity Model, developed by Beutler and Owen (1980) was used as the basic framework for the study. Household production, which is performed by and for household members, may be considered productive and is characterized by having use value rather than exchange value.

The design of the study was a two stage survey. Initial contact was made with a brief mailed questionnaire to a random sample of Edmonton households. Stage II involved a detailed telephone interview. A total of 107 home sewers participated in both stages of the study. Respondents provided information about sewing activities, sources of sewing education, the value of home sewing, satisfaction with sewing and perception of the activity as housework or leisure. Demographic information was recorded and a profile of Edmonton home sewers was developed. Analysis of variance, t-tests and chi-square statistics were used to test the hypotheses.

Findings indicated that the type of sewing done most frequently was mending. The most useful source of sewing education was home economics classes and the most common reason for sewing was to economize. Home sewing projects were worn or used a great deal and level of satisfaction experienced by home sewers was also high. Very few sewers were dissatisfied with any aspect of sewing measured. Respondents viewed home sewing primarily as a leisure activity or as a combination of housework and leisure. Significant associations were found between perception of home sewing as housework or leisure and reason for sewing and between perception of home sewing and the type of item sewn. Demographic characteristics had some influence on home sewers' perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity.

The findings are discussed in terms of a profile of home sewers, perception of sewing as housework or leisure, satisfaction experienced with home sewing, education sources for home sewers and the value of home sewing. The direction of future research is also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere gratitude to Dr. Nelma Fetterman, major professor, for her constant enthusiasm and encouragement. Her commitment to quality research has been a valuable influence and will continue to be throughout my career. Special thanks are extended to Dean Doris Badir, Dean of Home Economics and Dr. Verna Lefebvre, Faculty of Education for their valuable comments and continued interest in the study.

Appreciation is extended to the graduate students and staff in the department of clothing and textiles for a very rewarding time of study.

The author also wishes to express thanks to her family, particularly her mother Pearl Blenkarn for her time and skill at the typewriter and the computer.

Finally, the author gratefully acknowledges Pfaff Canada Inc. for their contribution of books and scissors as incentives for participation in the study.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Statement of the Problem	2
	B. Justification	3
	C. Objectives	4
	D. Hypotheses	5
	E. Definitions	5
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
	A. Informal Economy	7
	Household Economy	9
	Household Time Use	11
	B. Leisure	13
	C. Satisfaction	15
	General Satisfaction	16
	Satisfaction with Household Activities	17
	Satisfaction with Leisure Activities	18
	Clothing Satisfaction	21
	D. Home Sewing	22
	Reasons for Home Sewing	22
	Value of Home Sewing	26
	Profile of Home Sewers	27
	Education Related to Home Sewing	28
III.	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	31
	A. Conceptual Framework	31
	B. Method	33
	Sample Selection	34
	C. Instrument Development	34
	Initial Questionnaire	35
	Telephone Interview	36
	D. Analysis of Data	41
IV.	FINDINGS	42

A. Description of the Sample 42
Non-Sewers 42
B. Descriptive Analysis of the Variables - Stage I 43
Demographic Profile 43
C. Descriptive Analysis of the Variables - Stage II 47
Home Sewing Activities 47
Extended Home Sewing Activities 53
Mending Activities 60
Satisfaction with Home Sewing 62
Value of Home Sewing 66
Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure 67
D. Testing of the Hypotheses 68
V. DISCUSSION 79
A. General Characteristics of Home Sewers 79
Extended Profile of Home Sewers 81
B. Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure 82
C. Satisfaction with Home Sewing 84
D. Education Sources for Home Sewers 85
E. Value of Home Sewing 86
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 88
A. Summary 88
B. Conclusions 90
C. Recommendations 92
BIBLIOGRAPHY 95
APPENDICES 104
APPENDIX A 105
APPENDIX B 107
APPENDIX C 109

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Home Sewing Households: Household Size and Number of Home Sewers per Household	44
2.	Home Sewing Households: Number of Children at Home for Varying Family Sizes	45
3.	Age of Youngest Child in 119 Home Sewing Households	46
4.	Stage I Respondents: Home Sewers' Age, Marital Status and Education	48
5.	Years of Sewing Experience	49
6.	Type of Sewing Done Most Frequently	50
7.	Outside Sources of Sewing Information Consulted by 54 Home Sewers	51
8.	Useful Sources of Home Sewers' Sewing Education	52
9.	Home Sewers' Reasons for Sewing	54
10.	Household Income of Home Sewers and of Respondents Who Sew to Economize	55
11.	Home Sewers' Pattern Choices, Pattern Development and Use of Special Considerations and Time Saving Techniques	56
12.	Alterations Made by Home Sewers	57
13.	Home Sewing Projects: Frequency of Construction by Category	59
14.	Home Sewers' Mending Activities: Frequency, Priority Placed on Mending and Mending Performed Outside the Household	61
15.	Time Spent in Mending Activities by 101 Home Sewers	61
16.	Rotated Factor Loadings for Each Satisfaction Variable Within the Assigned Factor	64
17.	Amount of Satisfaction with Quality of Products and Resource Availability	65
18.	Estimated Value/Hour of Time Spent Sewing by 57 Home Sewers	67
19.	Percentage of Home Sewing Time Considered to be Housework, Leisure Activity and Other Activities	68
20.	Chi-Square Analysis of Association of Reasons for Sewing with Perception of Sewing as Housework or Leisure	74

21. Chi-Square Analysis of Association of Demographic Characteristics with Perception of Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure 76
22. Chi-Square Analysis of Association of Types of Items Sewn with Perception of Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure 77

I. INTRODUCTION

Home sewing has traditionally been an important method of producing clothing although the reasons for this have varied somewhat throughout the years. In the 1920s and 1930s sewing was an economic necessity (Chan, 1976; Fessler, 1971; Rockwell, 1974; "Sew and reap", 1958); however, since then numerous other benefits of home sewing have surfaced. Several peak periods of home sewing have been documented over the years, notably the 1970s. During the 1970s originality and creativity were expressed as reasons for sewing, and the majority of teenage girls were learning these skills through the school system ("Clothing, textiles," 1974; "Everybody's sewing like mad," 1967; Fessler, 1971; "I made it myself," 1971; "Inefficiency," 1972; Rockwell, 1974). Johnson (1960) stated the change as a graduation from "a household chore producing something serviceable with a homemade look, to a combination of art and craft . . . ." In contrast to the depression years when sewing was an essential activity to clothe the household, the 1970s home sewing served as a hobby or leisure activity.

The current status of home sewing, according to the pattern companies, indicates that in the last seven years the number of home sewers has fallen one third, along with a steady drop in pattern sales (Roman, 1983). In addition, the number of retailers selling fabrics, patterns and notions has dropped by approximately 50% since 1976. However, the level of professionalism of large chain fabric outlets is thought to have elevated the status of home sewing (Brill, 1983). A 1981 study of women who sew in Toronto provided some insight into why the number of Canadian home sewers appears to be dropping. Approximately one half of the Toronto respondents had decreased their sewing activity between 1979 and 1981 primarily because of time constraints placed on them by jobs and other leisure activities. The primary reason for decreased sewing activities, throughout the literature, is lack of time. Vanek (1974) investigated time spent in housework including clothing and linen care, and found that employed women spend about half as much time performing household tasks as nonemployed women. The decrease in time devoted to household activities is accompanied by an increase in the number of women entering the work force. In 1974 approximately 40% of married

women were in the work force (Vanek, 1974). An exploratory study of women who sew in metropolitan Toronto in 1981 indicated that more than 50% of Canadian females over age 15 were employed, compared to 30% in 1961.

Industry views as well as those of retailers on the state of home sewing have been documented. Publications such as *Making It*, directed at home sewers, however, have recently been stressing new sewing ideas. New reasons for sewing, improved patterns and techniques are some of the issues directed at the home sewing market (Burney, 1983). At a time when somewhat conflicting ideas are being stressed by various sewing sectors, current information is necessary from a primary source, the home sewer.

This study was designed to investigate specific aspects of home sewing in Edmonton. Home sewing as either a household activity or a leisure activity was studied. Specific areas of interest were: satisfaction with sewing activities, education sources for home sewers, value assigned to sewn items and reasons for sewing. A current profile of the home sewer was also developed.

A. Statement of the Problem

Home sewing, as an activity for which no payment is received, is frequently considered to be a hobby or leisure activity (Hawes, 1978; Hawes, Blackwell & Talarzyk, 1975). As a leisure pursuit, home sewing is included with painting, knitting, embroidery, candle making and other crafts (Hawes, Blackwell & Talarzyk, 1975). There are, however, aspects of home sewing which may not be considered leisurely by the home sewer. An alternate focus of home sewing is provided by the home economics related literature which includes sewing activities in household production (Berk, 1980; Nickols & Metzen, 1978; Owen & Beutler, 1981). To establish home sewing as either leisure or housework prior to investigation of home sewers' attitudes, activities, reasons for sewing, and satisfaction with sewing is premature.

The purpose of this study was to investigate what characteristics differentiate home sewers who define sewing as a household activity from those who define it as a leisure activity.

B. Justification

Throughout the most recent documented resurgence of home sewing, the 1970s, a great deal of information was available regarding who was sewing and why ("Clothing, Textiles," 1974; Fessler, 1971; "I made it myself," 1971; "Inefficiency," 1972; Pederson, 1972; Rockwell, 1974). Due to the economic prosperity of the time, the individual, creative benefits of sewing were stressed rather than economic savings. The recent downturn in the economy has resulted in an altered lifestyle, thus providing new reasons for home sewing ("Outlook on the 80's," 1981). Industry sources generally indicate that home sewing is currently declining and has been for the past five to seven years (Brill, 1983). However, there is very little information available from home sewers themselves, regarding the current state of sewing. Current information is needed in order to assess the changes, if any, that have taken place in attitudes toward home sewing and ideas and reasons for sewing.

A decline in the 1980s in home sewing has been attributed, in part, to the decreased importance placed on clothing construction within the schools (Courtless, 1982). Compared to 1971, when an estimated 85% of high school girls knew how to sew (*Forbes*, 1971), results of a 1981 study of Toronto home sewers showed that less than 60% of respondents considered the school an important source of sewing knowledge ("Exploratory study," 1981). A second proposed reason for a decline in home sewing has been the increased participation of women in the labor force (Courtless, 1982). Current information regarding a demographic profile of the home sewer as well as reasons for sewing, types of items sewn, attitudes toward the activity, and present sources of home sewing education is necessary to determine changing patterns among home sewers. Labor force participation determines time available for activities such as sewing, and as a result increased time in the work force may limit home sewing time (Arndt, Gronmo & Hawes, 1980; "Exploratory study," 1981).

Leisure studies have traditionally provided a frame of reference for sewing within leisure arts and crafts as well as hobbies such as needle work (Beard & Ragheb, 1980; Hawes, 1978; Hawes, Blackwell & Talarzyk, 1975). Due to the original, creative aspect of sewing, much of the research has placed home sewing into the category of a leisure

activity ("Everybody's sewing," 1967; "Exploratory study," 1981; Fessler, 1971; Johnson, 1960). Home economics, however, has also provided sewing with a place in the scheme of household production. Research conducted by Walker and Woods in 1976 (as reported in Murphy, 1979), dealt with household production and time use. Household work included, among other things, care and construction of clothing and household textiles. A limitation of the Walker and Woods study identified by Walker and Woods, involved neglecting to collect data regarding whether or not participants liked or disliked home sewing as an activity, and whether they considered it to be housework or leisure.

Margaret Reid (1934) earlier addressed the problem of satisfaction with household activities including clothing construction. The manipulative process of working with one's hands was thought to yield pleasure because a tangible product was evidence of the labor. An additional source of satisfaction was derived from the fact that household production was carried on in direct response to the needs of family members (Reid, 1934).

A third study indicating the dual position of home sewing as either leisure or housework was conducted by Nickols and Metzen (1978) and involved housework time. Success with measuring household production was limited as women tended to "under report" productive home activities. Underreporting occurred "since jobs such as home decorating, clothing construction, and other uses of time in creative endeavors that are also productive may have been reported as leisure time rather than housework" (p.89).

In order to determine accurately the current status of home sewing , knowledge of how home sewers perceive the activity (as leisure, household activity or something else) is needed. Assessment of satisfaction-dissatisfaction with sewing is necessary to determine how theoretical satisfactions derived from leisure activities differ from those derived from household work.

C. Objectives

The objectives of the study were to assess:

1. General characteristics of home sewers in the sample.
2. Whether home sewing is perceived as a housework or leisure activity by home

sewers.

3. The level of satisfaction with home sewing of sewers in the sample.
4. Useful sewing education sources for home sewers.
5. The home sewer's perceived value of a home sewn item, relative to the value of the same purchased item.

D. Hypotheses

The hypotheses, stated in the alternative form, tested for the study were:

1. A significant difference exists between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and
   a. reasons for sewing
   b. perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity
   c. demographic characteristics of home sewers
   d. types of items sewn
   e. sources of home sewing education
2. A significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and
   a. reasons for sewing
   b. demographic characteristics of the home sewers
   c. types of items sewn
   d. sources of home sewing education
3. A significant association exists between reasons for sewing and sources of home sewing education.

E. Definitions

1. **Informal economy** "involves both the production of goods and the provision of services in our homes and at the community level, generally not on a cash basis....It includes the activities that men, women and children perform to make their homes and communities more satisfying places. It is work that people do for one another in the community without thinking about monetary gain" (Ross & Usher, 1983, p.10).

2. **Household production**, as defined by Margaret Reid, "consists of those unpaid activities which are carried on, by and for the members, which activities might be replaced by market goods, or paid services, if circumstances such as income, market conditions, and personal inclinations permit the service being delegated to someone outside the household group" (Reid, 1934, p.11).
3. **Work** involves a productive activity yielding a result of economic or social value (Kelly, 1980).
4. **Leisure** involves social and recreational activities pursued for enjoyment (Nickols & Abdel-Ghany, 1983, p.190).
5. **Satisfaction** results from a subjective comparison of what was expected with what was, in fact, received (Oliver, 1981, p.38).
6. **Home sewing** involves the unpaid sewing activities carried out in the home using either sewing machines or handwork techniques to construct or repair garments, household textile items and crafts. Included are alterations, mending, patching and restyling of either home sewn or purchased items, in addition to regular sewing activities.
7. **Volume of sewing** is measured by the total number of new items produced within the past one year, as calculated by the total of 14 categories of sewing projects.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The four major sections of the review of literature appear in the following order. The informal economy, involving production within the household and household time use, is presented in the first section. The second section focuses on leisure time and activities. Satisfaction-dissatisfaction as it relates to both household activities and leisure activities, as well as methods of measuring satisfaction are covered in the third section. Lastly, home sewing is addressed generally and in terms of the value of home sewing and sources of education related to home sewing.

A. Informal Economy

The economy, as we refer to it currently, involves the business or market activities which are often thought to comprise the economy as a whole (Ross & Usher, 1983). This sector which is included in the gross national product (GNP) is, in fact, only the formal portion of the economy. The informal portion of the economy, also known as "the gift and barter economy" (Robertson, 1977), the underground, hidden, parallel, black, dual, cash, moonlight, submerged or twilight economies (Smith, 1981), refers to those activities performed outside the bounds of the formal market.

Several authors have provided definitions of the informal economy. Huber (1979) defines it as all other non-professional, non-scheduled, and non-market economic activities. Labor types are communal, or individual and include such activities as housework, nonpaid pursuits and neighborhood cooperation. The informal sector activities are not a part of the GNP, but rather, are held together by social and community life. The informal economy according to Gershuny (1979), is based on the non-money production of services within the household. In an attempt to address the broad span from the formal economy's corporate sector, through the public sector, community and non-profit groups to the household, the extreme small unit of the informal economy, Badir (1981) discusses the general characteristics of the informal economy. These are the cooperative social and economic networks which operate through exchanges of work,

skills, goods and services. Barter and gift are the mechanisms of exchange and the resulting benefit, production of shelter, food, clothing, social and recreational activity. Although the numerous informal activities are not a part of the GNP, Statistics Canada estimates that the household production sector would contribute another 40 - 50% to the GNP if recorded (Ross & Usher, 1983).

The informal economy is composed of several sectors, one of which includes *exchanges within the household* which are generally non-quantified (Gershuny, 1979). The homemaker or administrator of household consumption is an example of this as goods and services are produced for household consumption but because labors are not marketed, no value is assigned. The *communal production sector* includes voluntary or religious organizations, baby-sitting arrangements, transportation co-ops and housing improvement and renovation co-operatives. Some operate on a quasi-money exchange while others are on a sharing (favor for favor) basis. This sector is promoted by the rising cost of purchased service relative to the declining cost of domestic goods. A third sector of informal production exists as the hidden, underground or black economy. Distinct from the formal economy, it involves activities which are illegal, tax avoiding, or involve theft. The *underground* sector may be further divided into:

1. Occupational theft, tax evasion, business expenses.
2. Home employment such as garment piece work.
3. Goods and services for consumers such as home repairs.

These often exist to counteract inflexibilities of the formal labor market. While it is true that the informal economy in its entirety involves all of the previously mentioned sectors, for the purpose of this study the informal economy is limited to activities within the household. With these limitations in mind, Ross and Usher (1983) define the informal economy as involving "both the production of goods and the provision of services in our homes and at the community level, generally not on a cash basis . . . . It includes the activities that men, women and children perform to make their homes and communities more satisfying places. It is work that people do for one another in the community without thinking about monetary gain" (p.70).

Household Economy

The issue of economics within the household is by no means new. Scott Burns (1975) looked at the history of the household when it was considered a producing as well as a consuming institution. Within the past 150 years, we have seen the rise of the market economy and a move from individual, household efforts to industry and collective power. The household remains a social and economic institution; however, its economic activity exists outside the formal sector and is organized around giving, cooperation, mutual need and no use of money (Burns, 1975). The production function of the household, although viable, is limited by our constant focus on production of goods and by the lack of means of exchange for household production. Several authors, in looking at the future of the household economy foresee a resurgence of household importance (Burns, 1975; Caplovitz, 1981; Henderson, 1978; Huber, 1979). As long as economic problems continue and inflation prevails, the informal economy, and more specifically household production, is seen as being a viable alternative.

It is the performance of certain tasks in the household that have given much fuel to the women's movement. The question of housework being assigned a realistic monetary value has been discussed at great length in the literature. If tasks performed can be replaced by purchased goods and services, is the value of work performed in the household equal to that of the marketplace? Hildegarde Kneeland (1920) addressed the problem of placing a value on housework, and the estimation of wages for housework as a solution. Wage estimates based on replacement costs of a paid household worker were found to be inaccurate as no one worker can serve as a full substitute, some tasks cannot be effectively performed by a substitute and the number of hours necessary to fill the position is difficult to determine.

In an effort to avoid the issue of time spent on housework, a proposed method of estimating the household worker's monetary value is to determine the cost of giving up activities in the formal labor force to perform household tasks (Glazer-Malbin, 1976; Walker, 1973). This method, too, has its drawbacks and has been criticized. Galbraith (1973) raises the issue of diminishing earning power as more time is spent out of the work force. This alone limits the use of this method of assessing housework value. In 1978, Hawrylyshyn, in a report prepared for Statistics Canada, questioned the adequacy

of GNP as a measure of economic performance when it excluded non-market activities. The result was a proposed definition of household work and two theoretical measurement formulas derived from it. Hawrylyshyn defined household work as "those economic services produced in the household and outside the market, but which could be produced by a third person hired on the market without changing their utility to the members of the household." The formulas derived from this evaluate housework by either:

1. determining the market replacement cost of each separate household task or
2. estimating the cost of replacing housework by the use of a single housekeeper.

The opportunity cost method was once again seen as being limited.

Thus far, the literature has not been able to provide an accurate assessment of household activities on a salary basis. There is consistency, however, in the development of a definition of household production or housework. Proulx (1978) uses the term housework as defined by Walker and Woods (1976), the sum of all useful activities performed in the home to provide goods and services enabling the family to function as a family. Housework activities included:

a. food preparation: regular meals, special meals, freezing and other such activities, after-meal cleanup;
b. care of family members;
c. seasonal and regular maintenance of yard, house, car;
d. care of clothing: washing, ironing, cleaning, sewing and mending;
e. shopping, household management and maintenance of accounts.

This definition, consistent with several others, distinguishes home economic activities as those which could be hired out to other workers. Household production, as defined by Reid (1934), "consists of those unpaid activities which are carried on, by and for the members, whose activities might be replaced by market goods, or paid services, if circumstances such as income, market conditions, and personal inclination permit the service being delegated to someone outside the household group."

The proposed replacement of household labor with market labor, so common amongst sources, is also related to the woman's role in the household. Society in general has been educated to believe that a salary is the key to influence within the household. The household economy, therefore, has in the past been somewhat invisible

as it is controlled by women, and women's work is thought to be demeaning and of limited value (Galbraith, 1975; Glazer-Malbin, 1976). Current trends indicate that the informal economy is becoming more important within society and that the household may regain some of its producing function (Quilling, 1982; Schumaker, 1973). Gershuny (1979) puts forth three alternatives for growth if current trends in public policy continue:

1. growth in service and manufacturing sectors.
2. suppression of informal sector through enforced taxation and other means.
3. exploiting the benefits of the informal sector (duality).

The current state of the formal economy forces us to face the issue of a dual economy where there is movement between the formal and informal sectors. Huber (1979) sees the ideal as a balanced duality between institutional and informal sectors, with the institutional sector comprising registered business, public and private institutions and industries. His informal sector is composed of non-scheduled, non-professional, non-market economic activities, or individual self-supporting work.

A home production activity such as home sewing is performed by and for household members with the output having use value rather than exchange value (Beutler & Owen, 1980). Within the community, however, activities such as home sewing may take on exchange value in the gift and barter system, or pushed to extreme may become part of the black-market economy in the form of co-ops and home based cottage industry (Burney, 1983; Smith, 1983).

Household Time Use

More recent articles deal with issues which directly affect the number of hours devoted to housework. Vanek (1974) looked at participation in the labor force and its effect on household activities. In the early 1970s, non-employed women spent almost as much time at household tasks as did their counterparts in the 1920s; however, employed women spent less time. Assuming essential tasks in the household are accomplished by both employed and non-employed women, other factors such as family size, composition and other values and pressures must be involved to explain time discrepancies involved in household production. According to Vanek (1974), housework included tasks classified as shopping and managerial, family care, food

preparation, cleaning and laundry, and clothing related activities.

A 1980 study by Schnittgrund investigated time use of household heads who were employed and household heads who were unemployed. Intended to study the problems and activities associated with unemployment, this research is related to the issue of household production and home sewing as it suggests that if utility results from time use, it should be classified as productive in spite of whether or not the activity is a market or non-market one (Schnittgrund, 1980). Activities resulting in measurable products (earning income, home sewing), if placed on a continuum of productivity, might represent one extreme and activities such as sleep might represent the other extreme. The Schnittgrund study reported that time was reallocated to household and leisure activities to some extent during unemployment, however, consistent with other results females tended to spend more time on household activities than males.

Hafstrom and Schram (1983) investigated housework time of wives using the basic framework of the Nickols and Metzen study of 1978. Variables involved in the housework time issue included:

1. wife's hours in labor force,
2. family size,
3. age of youngest child and
4. women's increased education.

Hafstrom and Schram reported that wife's hours in the labor force acted as a constraint on the amount of time spent in housework while increased family size was positively related to time spent in housework. Age of youngest child and wife's occupation did not significantly increase the time spent in housework activities nor did a woman's increased education increase productivity or efficiency of housework.

Rather than addressing the issue of household tasks from a male and a female perspective, a 1983 study by Abdel-Ghany and Nickols investigated the differential existing between the household work time of husbands and wives. The sample was comprised of dual-earner families. For both husbands and wives number of minutes of paid work was negatively related to minutes spent doing housework, however, wives still spent more time in household work than husbands. Abdel-Ghany and Nickols found that the housework time differential was not explained by variables tested, including education,

wage rates, time spent in paid work and age. One explanation for the differential in housework time, suggested in the literature, was the persistence of traditional norms determining division of labor in the household. This explanation was not viewed as a particularly satisfactory one.

A review of existing Canadian family time use data by Douthitt (1984) provides some useful information regarding women in the labor force as well as discussing data shortcomings and future prospects. Four variables have been found to be significant in determining the probability a married woman would enter the labor market. The first, wife's level of education, has been found to have a positive effect on the probability that she will enter the labor market. The presence of children influences participation as the more children, or the lower the age of the youngest child, the less likely a married woman is to work. The fourth variable, husband's income, although not as significant, has a negative effect on the wife working (Douthitt, 1984). Douthitt also suggested evidence, from the data, of a change in hours worked by married women. The same factors affecting labor force participation also affected hours worked, with the addition of a wage factor. Generally the higher the wage, the fewer hours worked annually. Douthitt reports figures from Statistics Canada in 1975, when 78% of married women who worked did so full-time, and from 1982 when only 74% of women working were employed full-time. The suggested explanation for the decreased full-time percentage has been a general trend towards part-time labor. Major shortcomings in data identified by Douthitt included the lack of research into time use of non-traditional family structures.

B. Leisure

In order to understand and accurately define the concept of leisure one must consider its relationship to another concept, work. In conjunction with this, problems related to defining either work or leisure depend on criteria used to describe one as the basis from which to define the other (Spiller, 1981). If work is defined as employment or occupation then perhaps leisure is non-work or free time. The issue of time presents another problem when defining leisure. A time budget approach to leisure by Arndt, Gronmo and Hawes (1980) places leisure behavior with everyday life activities. As a part

of this network of related activities, leisure must be viewed in the context of time use and function of activities. Based on time budgets, leisure is defined as being truly discretionary time, what is left of the 168 hours of the week when time devoted to work , routine home and family duties, and sleep is subtracted (Voss & Blackwell, 1975).

The allocation of time to leisure activities is dependent upon time devoted to other activities, specifically career-oriented and home-oriented ones (Arndt, Gronmo & Hawes, 1980). A negative relationship is expected between career-oriented and leisure activities due to the high opportunity cost of leisure, for employed persons. For the same reasons, home and career-oriented activities should be negatively related. Leisure and home-oriented activities are expected to be positively related for persons specializing in home-oriented activities. Leisure provides an escape from confinement within the household for these persons with a small career-oriented component in their day. From these distinctions, the following three categories were developed:

Career-oriented activities include job and work-related activities (including education), as well as commuting to and from work.

Home-oriented activities include shopping, housework, necessary yard and home maintenance, and care and recreation with children.

Leisure activities include reading, watching television, hobbies, games, and crafts, visiting, participation in sports and exercise, attending spectator events and other entertainment outside the home (Arndt et al., 1980).

Time budgeted to hobbies, games and crafts, possibly including home sewing, totalled 5.6 hours per week for females and 4.1 hours per week for males in the United States (Arndt et al., 1980). Hobbies as leisure activities occupied 4 - 4.5 hours per week according to a study by Francken and van Raaij (1981).

A study by Donald and Havighurst (1959) which attempted to determine meanings of leisure classified leisure activities into 11 categories of which one category involved manual-manipulative activities, sewing and handwork for women, carpentry, home repairs and woodworking for men. Meanings associated with manual-manipulative activities included achieving something, being creative, helping financially.

The aformentioned studies, as well as one done in Toronto with women who sewed in 1981, indicate the various activities competing for leisure time. The increased

participation of women in the labor force decreases the amount of leisure time available as well. The relationship between employment, work and leisure has been defined by placing leisure on a continuum (Kelly, 1980).

Employment is defined as a job with specific responsibilities and rewards.

Work is productive activity which yields a result of economic or social value.

Non-work is activity outside the employment schedule and obligations and includes leisure.

Leisure is activity chosen primarily for anticipated experiences, intrinsic and relational.

Leisure, defined in this case as non-work activity, is also non-productive as work is assumed productive. It is possible to define leisure in terms of non-work without the connotation of non-productivity. This approach is preferable in the present study when considering the variety of types of leisure activities and reasons for participation in them. Hawes, Blackwell and Talarzyk (1975) define leisure time as that not obligated a priori to work, work-related activities, life maintenance activities, routine family duties and responsibilities, and routine social and civic responsibilities. A similar approach, taken by Murphy (1979), develops a formula for determining leisure time.

Leisure time = (Time available after meeting basic physiological and personal needs) - (Time spent at work) - (Time allocated to home responsibility).

The amount of time devoted to leisure as well as the type of activity chosen, reasons for participation and value or satisfaction received from leisure may depend on variables such as sex, household characteristics, income, age and other demographics (Arndt et al., 1980). In addition to demographic characteristics, personality variables are also thought to affect leisure decisions (Donald & Havighurst, 1959). Some resolution may be found in the study of satisfaction in relation to leisure.

C. Satisfaction

Satisfaction as it relates to the present study will be discussed in terms of:

1. General satisfaction.
2. Satisfaction with household activities.

3. Satisfaction with leisure activities.
4. Satisfaction with clothing.

General Satisfaction

The concept of satisfaction is an important one to many aspects of research as well as to business and marketing. Researchers agree that it is, if nothing else, an extremely complex process which is difficult to measure with any accuracy (Oliver, 1981). With respect to consumers and product satisfaction, earliest attempts at measurement dealt with cognitive dissonance or the anxiety felt after making a decision. A second approach to satisfaction looked at the process of psychologically reconciling observed characteristics with expectations. More recently, studies of satisfaction have focused on the subjective comparison of what was expected with what was actually received (Oliver, 1981).

In terms of consumption, satisfaction may be viewed in one of two ways according to Hafstrom and Dunsing (1972). Future oriented satisfaction deals with items that create relatively more satisfaction in the future than in the present, while present oriented satisfactions deal with items providing more satisfaction in the present than in the future. It is assumed that accurate measurement of the type and amount of satisfaction received from goods enables the researcher to predict future consumption activities of families or individuals. Consumption in this context is viewed as using up of utility or gaining of satisfaction (Hafstrom & Dunsing, 1972).

If satisfaction is to affect future activities, it has been suggested that the aspects of satisfaction be addressed separately (Oliver, 1981). **Predicting satisfaction** involves being aware of what causes or affects it. Some proposed causes of consumer satisfaction include cognitive dissonance, shopping effort, notion of utility and product performance. Due to the fact that performance is perceived subjectively and is evaluated relative to expectations, it has been shown to be a poor predictor of satisfaction (Oliver, 1981). A consumption approach to predicting satisfaction by Hafstrom and Dunsing (1972) assumes the amount of satisfaction received from identical goods is not necessarily the same for all persons. Experience and observation indicate that factors affecting satisfaction include previous stock of items, the cost of an item

relative to income and the number of uses the item is perceived as having (Hafstrom & Dunsing, 1972). **Measuring satisfaction** is a difficult task as well whether it is done directly or indirectly. Oliver (1981) suggests disguised or indirect methods of measuring satisfaction due to the limited success with some satisfied-dissatisfied questions; however, problems may be encountered with either method.

Satisfaction with Household Activities

The assumption is generally made that when household activity or housework is addressed, the work of women is being discussed (Ferree, 1976; Friedan, 1981). Until recently it was also assumed that housework was a generally satisfying occupation. Some of the major drawbacks to housework are the lack of social contact and sense of powerlessness (Ferree, 1976). In addition, there is the lack of recognition of household work as valuable work, thus adding to the feeling of powerlessness. The alternative seems rather simple in light of the state of household dissatisfaction; however, there are too many variables involved for a simple solution to suffice. Ferree (1976) suggests that paid employment for working-class women, although not totally gratifying, provides some sense of power, meaning, and relief from social isolation felt by full-time household workers.

In the 1976 study by Ferree of the relative satisfaction of housework and paid work, it was determined that working class women having paid jobs are more satisfied than those who are full-time homemakers. Part-time employment was the most satisfactory compromise for the sample of women. A partial explanation of dissatisfaction with housework may involve self esteem of the worker. Lack of performance standards and reluctance to recognize housework as valuable does little to produce feelings of competence. Compared to 50 years ago, homemaker's contribution to the family economy is even less clear. While household consumption and production were once almost inseparable, the focus of production is no longer in the home and although domestic activities are important to the family they are accepted as natural and are not regarded as equal to contributions of the wage earner (Vanek, 1974). Paid employment may, for many women, provide the self esteem that is missing from household work. The sense of powerlessness often resulting from the fact that

household work is not considered valuable, is frequently relieved when an economic contribution is made through a paid occupation.

Household production in terms of specific activities may be a source of satisfaction as opposed to dissatisfaction. In 1934, Margaret Reid discussed the fact that satisfaction was generally derived from work and economic status rather than from household activities. In spite of the common feelings of dissatisfaction with homemaking, it was suggested that lingering arts and crafts such as food preparation and clothing construction provided tasks constituting a source of satisfaction to many. "A manipulative process yields pleasure to one who likes to work with her hands, and a tangible product as the evidence of her labor. The fashioning of materials, seeing work develop under ones hands, affords a means of self-expression to some. . ." (Reid, 1934). An additional source of satisfaction has been suggested (Ferree, 1976; Reid, 1934) through household production carried out in direct response to needs of family members.

At a time when there is a great thrust toward employment in the formal economy, it is not expected that a great deal of satisfaction will be derived from household activities. If the thrust is turned to the informal sector of the economy, there are many opportunities to derive satisfactions from household activities and skills (Haiven, 1982; Smith, 1981).

Satisfaction with Leisure Activities

Research related to leisure and its meaning was initiated to equip people to make the most satisfying use of their leisure time as the time devoted to such activities increased (Donald & Havighurst, 1959). At this time, the expression of a satisfaction or a reason for carrying on a particular activity was termed a meaning. In a study by Donald and Havighurst (1959), questions were raised regarding the relationship of satisfaction to different leisure activities, and the systematic relationship of meanings or satisfactions to age, sex, social class and personal characteristics. Results indicated that various classifications of leisure produced different types of satisfaction. In the case of home sewing, a manual-manipulative activity, significantly associated satisfactions or meanings included:

1. Sense of achievement

2. Being creative
3. Financial help

Contact with friends and benefit to society were meanings found not to be related to manual-manipulative activities. When considering the relationship of sex to leisure meanings, creativity was considered unimportant by 24% of the women compared to 6% of the men (Donald & Havighurst, 1959). Although some trends were indicated in socio-economic status, relations between age and meanings were unfounded.

Hawes, Blackwell and Talarzyk (1975) have provided an assessment of leisure satisfaction as well as an insight into satisfaction measurement. Satisfaction was defined for the purpose of the study as "the meanings or significance which leisure-time pursuits hold for the respondent, as perceived by the respondent. These meanings can be viewed as perceived psychological 'outputs' in a model of decision making or benefits from participating in a pursuit" (Hawes et al., 1975). Measurement of leisure satisfaction was accomplished by Beard and Ragheb (1980) with the use of a Leisure Satisfaction Scale designed to measure the extent to which individuals perceive that personal needs are being met through leisure activities. Leisure satisfaction includes the positive feelings or perceptions formed, elicited or gained by an individual as a result of engaging in leisure activities. It is the degree of pleasure or contentment with general leisure experiences (Beard & Ragheb, 1980). Effects or satisfactions resulting from leisure activities were defined and categorized to become the major elements in the Leisure Satisfaction Scale. The following six categories of leisure satisfaction comprise the subscales of the instrument:

1. **Psychological** - involves intrinsic motivation to participate in leisure activities. Achieving a sense of accomplishment, fulfillment of self-actualization needs, self-expression and individuality are also included in this category.
2. **Educational** - involves intellectual stimulation, opportunities to experience.
3. **Social** - satisfies a need for belongingness, opportunities to meet friends.
4. **Relaxational** - involves relief of stress.
5. **Physiological** - involves challenge and physical fitness.
6. **Aesthetic** - provides interest in leisure activities by making the physical environment more satisfying.

Assessment of satisfaction with each of these subscales or effects was based on a 5-point Likert scale (Beard & Ragheb, 1980). The use of Likert scales to measure satisfaction, particularly with leisure activities is evident throughout the literature. In 1978 , a study by Hawes dealing with satisfaction of leisure time pursuits made use of the 5-point Likert scale to assess specific satisfactions as well as an overall feeling of satisfaction. Hawes evaluated 32 satisfaction statements adapted from sources such as the 1959 Donald and Havighurst study as they related to favorite leisure time pursuits of respondents (Hawes, 1978). A further grouping of statements was possible to observe related satisfactions.

A slightly different approach to leisure and satisfaction was taken by Francken and van Raaij (1981). Satisfaction in this case was assumed to be relative and was judged in terms of several standards. Expectations, achievement in other areas of life, and perceived satisfaction others derive from leisure served as standards. The perceptions of internal barriers such as ability, knowledge and interest, and external barriers (lack of time and money) as blockages to attaining satisfaction limited the use of this study as a measure of general satisfaction. The scales used, however, were quite similar to those of Beard and Ragheb (1980) and Donald and Havighurst (1959). Based on a two-fold classification of actual leisure satisfaction and expectation of reaching desired leisure satisfaction, several types of satisfaction-dissatisfaction were determined. Ten-point scales were used to measure the classifications. For example, satisfaction rated 6 or more, and dissatisfaction 4 or less on a scale from 1 to 10 (Francken & van Raaij, 1981).

Studies related to measuring satisfaction with leisure generally indicate success in determining the satisfaction associated with leisure activities (Hawes et al., 1975; Hawes, 1978; Beard & Ragheb, 1980). Use of the Likert-type scale in a mailed questionnaire is a standard procedure throughout the literature. Results of the Hawes, Blackwell and Talarzyk (1975) study include some measure of the frequency of participation in leisure activities. A category of creative crafts or handicrafts, including sewing, ranked 8th in popularity for females and 38th for males of 47 possible leisure activities. Results also indicated that 83.9% of females and 18.4% of males had participated in the activity at least once within the year (Hawes et al., 1975). Satisfaction results in the study were classified in groups associated with certain activities, and in terms of most important to

each sex. Among women the most important satisfactions included peace of mind, chance to learn about new things, getting the most out of life and escape from home and family pressures. Specifically related to craft and sewing activities, the satisfactions received by women included:

1. skill development
2. creativity
3. feeling of mastery
4. mental challenge
5. feeling of independence
6. feeling of control (Hawes et al., 1975)

These findings were consistent with the 1978 study by Hawes as well.

Clothing Satisfaction

Clothing satisfaction has been addressed in several studies over many years; however, in each case purchased clothing has been the focus (Lowe, 1979; Lowe & Dunsing, 1981; Ryan, 1954; Wall, 1974; Wall, Dickey & Talarzyk; 1978). Aspects of clothing satisfaction have included wear, care, performance, fiber content, quality and quantity of garments. Concentration on sociological and economic determinants of satisfaction have also been documented in the area of clothing (Lowe, 1979).

A study of satisfaction with blouses was undertaken by Ryan (1954) to determine various factors affecting satisfaction. The in-home interview was used in this case, and degree of satisfaction measured by the amount the blouse was worn (much, little or never). Several factors affected the frequency of wear, notably ease of care, fiber content and age of the blouse as wearings were less frequent with age. It was also noted that home sewn blouses or those made by dressmakers were less satisfactory than those purchased (Ryan, 1954).

A study by Lowe (1979) investigating socio-economic and social-psychological determinants of clothing satisfaction utilized the personal interview as well. In this case, satisfaction with clothing was measured in terms of quality and quantity, on a 7-point Likert scale. Ten of the 22 independent variables were socio-economic, and the other 12, social-psychological. Objectively measurable indicators of income and social class

made up the socio-economic variables while the more subjective concepts such as feeling, perception and choice formed the social-psychological variables (Lowe & Dunsing, 1981). Results indicated that in predicting satisfaction with clothing, social-psychological variables were far more important than were socio-economic ones. The most important determinant of clothing satisfaction, according to Lowe (1979), was satisfaction with material well-being as opposed to actual income. In addition, perception of clothing income adequacy proved to be more important than actual income; thus, the theory of utility (more money for more clothing provides more satisfaction) was questioned in this instance.

An alternate method of measuring clothing satisfaction was utilized by Wall (1975). A mailed self-completed questionnaire, after an initial telephone contact, was used to collect five types of data:

1. Clothing performance satisfaction
2. Activities, interests and opinions
3. Clothing performance problems
4. Textile knowledge test
5. Demographics (Wall, Dickey & Talarzyk, 1978)

A Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 5 measured the clothing performance satisfaction, activities, interests and opinions and clothing performance problems. A relationship was found between satisfaction and demographic and lifestyle characteristics, as well as textile knowledge (Wall, 1974; Wall et al., 1978). It was determined that satisfaction could be predicted and profiled.

D. Home Sewing

Home sewing is addressed in terms of reasons for sewing, the value of home sewing, available profiles of home sewers and education related to sewing activities.

Reasons for Home Sewing

Within the past few decades the popularity of home sewing has fluctuated a great deal. Home sewers have also expressed many reasons for participating in sewing

throughout the years. In 1948, *Business Week* reported on Singer's increase of sales indicating that a home sewing boom was in the process. An increase in both machine sales and pattern sales as well as an upsurgence in enrolment in sewing classes, indicated that home sewing popularity was surpassing pre-war levels ("Home-sewing booms Singer", 1948). Reasons for this home sewing boom included high cost ready-made clothing and the prosperity of the time. Ten years later, *Time* magazine reported that the home sewing boom was as strong as ever. It was estimated that approximately 20% of all feminine clothes were made at home, and that women sewed an average of four to six garments per year. In 1958, the economical reasons for sewing that were prevalent in the 1920s were no longer valid. The November, 1958 issue of *Time* provided three current reasons for sewing:

1. Trading up. Sewing to save money on an original design. Vogue and McCall's patterns were aimed at this market.
2. Art form. Sewing as a hobby or creative art.
3. No dry cleaning. Indicating that new equipment and accessories allowed the home sewer to construct professional garments and household items such as draperies, easily and with less complex care requirements.

Home sewing as a hobby or leisure time activity was popularized in the literature throughout the 1960s. Johnson (1960) discussed developments in fabrics and ready-to-wear, indicating that home sewing for thrift was a thing of the past. Shapiro (1967) agreed with this and suggested that sewing for creativity or as a hobby was perhaps a more accurate reason for increased sales. Creative expression, according to Johnson (1960), meant that sewing had graduated from "a household chore producing something serviceable with a homemade look, to a combination art and craft. . ."(p. 572). Sewing in the 1960s filled the need for self-expression and creativity.

Economy, although not a primary reason for sewing, was seen as a benefit of home sewing ("Everybody's sewing like mad," 1967). The economic benefits came from producing a professionally made, original garment for less than it would cost to purchase. Unfortunately, production of a garment was, and still is, time consuming. Consequently, an item in *Changing Times* (1967) portrayed the home sewer as one devoted to hours of pattern and fabric preparation, pattern adjustment and seam ripping. However, it was

stressed that to ensure enjoyment, sewing had to remain a hobby; otherwise, it became another household chore.

The increased popularity of home sewing in the 1970s has been documented frequently in the literature ("Clothing, textiles and home sewing," 1974; Fessler, 1971; "I made it myself," 1971; "Inefficiency," 1972; Rockwell, 1974). The major reason for the sewing boom in each case was an increase in the price and a decrease in quality of ready-made clothing. In an article entitled "I made it myself", *Forbes* magazine estimated that in 1971 in the United States, 44 million females between the ages of 12 and 65 sewed. In 1974 the estimate was 50 million ("Clothing, textiles and home sewing", 1974). Once again rather than stressing economics specifically, pattern and sewing companies stressed individual, original fashion, at a reduced price ("I made it myself," 1971). The major reasons for sewing outlined by Fessler (1971) were:

1. To cut retail costs and
2. To be creative, as sewing was a valid leisure activity.

Pederson (1972) investigated reasons for sewing among home economics students and found that approximately 50% sewed to save money, 25% for enjoyment, 14% for individuality, and 5% for each of fit and quality.

American Fabrics and Fashions (1973) included a report from the home sewing front which provided some statistics on the U.S. market as well as some retailers' predictions. Home sewing, according to the report, was a $3 billion industry in 1973. An estimated $2 billion of that amount was done in fabrics. The fabric end use breakdown included:

Women's Apparel	56%
Girl's Apparel	16%
Men's Apparel	3%
Boy's Apparel	2%
Home Furnishings	16%
Miscellaneous	7%

The women's apparel category was further divided into; dresses (28%), sportswear (15%), suits/coats (8%) and lingerie, etc.(5%). According to the report, at that time retail fabric sales were approximately evenly divided between knits and wovens. Increasing figures

suggested that 1973 was not the end of the home sewing boom (Report from the home sewing front, 1973); however, other sources have documented a decrease in home sewing in the late 1970s (Spanovich, 1982).

Home sewing in the 1980s has a new outlook according to *Homesewing Trade News* ("Outlook on the 80's," 1981). A down turn in the economic sector has resulted in a changing lifestyle. Home sewing has been promoted as an alternative in order to maintain and upgrade a lifestyle. The economic importance placed on sewing here resulted from retailers' findings. In December 1981, *Homesewing Trade News* once again addressed sewing, but from a consumer point of view. Results of the survey indicated that most frequently mentioned reasons for sewing included pleasure and fun of sewing, creativity, relaxation and excitement about new fabrics and fashions. Consumers rated personal satisfaction higher than economic saving as a reason for sewing ("Consumers say they sew," 1981). Consumer expenditure survey results reported by Courtless (1982) indicated that as spending for sewing increased, so did spending for ready-to-wear. Thus home sewers were not substituting home sewing for purchased garments as would be expected if economy was the reason for sewing. Another home sewing study performed by McHugh (1982) found that three reasons for sewing were rated very important. Saving money through sewing was suggested by 52.2% of sewers in the sample followed by achieving a sense of pride and obtaining better quality items than those purchased.

Currently, sources tell us that pattern sales and the number of home sewers are decreasing (Brill, 1983). Roman (1983) reports that Simplicity's pattern sales have declined steadily during the past five years. In addition, over the past seven years the number of active home sewers in the United States is estimated to have fallen one third, from 33 million to 22 million. These active home sewers represent only 28% of the adult female population (Brill, 1983). Many activities compete for the time available and home sewing is losing out. In order to combat the decline reported by pattern companies, new reasons for sewing are being stressed. Home decorating and craft items as well as children's clothing are promoted as alternatives (Brill, 1983; "It pays to sew," 1983). In the fall 1983 issue of *Making It*, homesewers are encouraged to use home sewing to add a creative dimension to other hobbies as well.

Recent trends attempt to inform the home sewer about alternatives to traditional sewing projects and ideas. In an attempt to regain the home sewer lost to other activities, employment and lack of free time, home sewing is being promoted as an activity allowing a great deal of freedom to create, and to contribute to other activities. Home sewing involves a broad range of ideas and activities and is no longer simply clothing construction.

Value of Home Sewing

In order to assess the value of home sewing, it is necessary to look at the value of a non-market activity. If home sewing is assumed to be a housework activity, the market cost approach to assessing value may be useful. The market cost approach attempts to measure the value of housework directly, using the cost of a worker hired to perform a task (Ferber & Birnbaum, 1977). A replacement for the home sewer, the professional sewer, must assign a value to the task in order to make a profit. Ferrari (1983), in an article designed to help home sewers enter into a business venture, indicated that research into the price of tailors' and dry cleaners' activities should precede placing a worth on sewing. Full-service dressmakers' research was directed toward ready-to-wear prices. A common method of payment for sewing activities involves piece work and in these ventures, time saving is essential. Profit sewing workshops stress custom techniques, time saving methods and other construction topics (Smith & Reilly, 1983). Time saving techniques have been studied in relation to homemakers as well, indicating the value of quick techniques in construction (Knapp & Winakor, 1979).

A recent Canadian study by McHugh (1982) involved time allocation to home sewing. Economic and non-economic variables were studied including prices of materials for sewing, prices of market produced alternatives to home-sewn articles, value of consumers' time and unearned income. Non-economic variables included demographics and sewing related variables. The study was aimed at both sewers and non-sewers, with sewers comprising 80% of the sample. Home sewers were further divided into current and latent categories. Current sewers were those who had sewn within the previous year (81.3%) and latent sewers had not sewn within the previous year (18.7%). Four factors were found to be significantly related to home sewing time

allocation:

1. Perception of quickly rising fabric prices was positively related to time allocated to sewing. (Consumers' perceptions of prices were involved rather than actual price increases. In addition, increased time allocation did not necessarily involve more projects.)
2. Time allocated to home sewing decreased with increased socioeconomic status.
3. Women employed full-time spent less time sewing than those not employed or employed part-time.
4. Women who perceived their skills to be relatively high spent more time sewing than did the beginner. (Those with a lower skill level perhaps saw sewing as difficult) (McHugh, 1982; McHugh, Wall & Frisbee, 1985).

Information about problems associated with home sewing was also obtained from both sewers and non-sewers. The major complaint from sewers and non-sewers was the time consuming aspect of home sewing. A second common problem associated with home sewing was the level of skill required and difficulty of sewing. Results of the McHugh study seemed to suggest that the sample of sewers, although concerned with the time consuming aspect of sewing, valued the products enough to allocate time to the activity. This was particularly true of those sewers who saw their investment in materials increasing in value and of home sewers with increased skill levels (McHugh et al., 1985).

Profile of Home Sewers

Few studies are available which provide relatively current information about home sewers and their activities. Data collected in Canada in 1982 by McHugh provided some valuable demographic information about home sewers although it was primarily aimed at time allocation. The sample consisted of 621 sewers and non-sewers. The majority of the sample, 80%, were home sewers. Eighty-five percent of the total sample was married and 46% had two or more children at home. Approximately 69% were high school graduates and 48% were employed in some capacity. Respondents represented a group somewhat older than the average Canadian population as 48% were between the ages of 49 and 59 years. The mean number of hours spent home sewing was

investigated and reported by season;

Spring ..... 25.3 hours
Winter ..... 24.8 hours
Autumn ..... 24.7 hours
Summer ..... 15.8 hours

and by category; garments (51.3), home decorating items (20.8) and crafts (15.2) (McHugh et al., 1985).

A home sewing market study aimed at retailers and home sewing markets was undertaken for *Sew News*, an American based home sewing publication, in 1984. The sample consisted of 775 subscribers of *Sew News*. Females comprised 98% of the sample of home sewers and on average these women had been sewing for 30 years. The average age of sewers in the sample was 46 years. Approximately 78% of respondents were married, 8% single and 12% divorced/separated/widowed. Of the 60% of home sewers who were employed, 39% were employed full-time and 21% part-time. The average yearly income calculated for the sample was $40,300. Level of education of *Sew News* subscribers was:

Completed high school 22.9%
Attended college 31.5%
Graduated college 21.5%
Post graduate work 19.5%

(Signet Research, 1984).

Sewing activities reported included the average annual sewing expenditure for the sample ($540.40) which included fabric, notions and patterns. Respondents also indicated whether they designed their own clothes always (3%), frequently (24%), sometimes (49%) or never (22%) (Signet Research, 1984).

Education Related to Home Sewing

The home sewer obtains information regarding how to sew from a variety of sources. The college clothing construction program as one source is often questioned due to the fact that an economic need to sew clothing is no longer recognized, according to Werden (1960). However, it was recognized that sewing could be a creative outlet.

In 1965, McElderry looked at sewing practices of clothing construction graduates and other graduates to determine if differences existed. Two hundred twenty-seven women participated with the instructed group being those who had college clothing construction training, and the uninstructed group being those who had not. McElderry found that instructed women did more of every type of sewing and spent more time at it. They also selected more difficult projects. Reasons for sewing differed between the groups as instructed women sewed to:

1. make new clothing
2. alter clothing

The uninstructed women sewed to:

1. alter clothing
2. mend

The majority of the instructed women in the study had learned to sew prior to college instruction, but indicated that the college instruction was more meaningful than that received elsewhere and that it stimulated them to try new techniques (McElderry, 1965).

The school system has also been a major source of sewing instruction. An estimated 85% of high school girls in 1969 knew how to sew and were creating many garments for many reasons, including wardrobe variety, economic savings, originality and better quality ("Home sewing boom calls," 1969). In addition to the school system, mothers, friends, organizations such as 4H and retailers' sewing courses were credited with having trained teenage sewers (Fessler, 1971). Another source, *Forbes* magazine, also estimated that 85% of girls graduated from high school each year knew how to sew; however, in this case, home economics classes were given all of the credit ("I made it myself," 1971).

In 1972, Pederson looked at clothing construction behavior of some women university students. Reports of where they had obtained most of their sewing knowledge involved schools in approximately 50% of cases, and mothers in slightly more than 50%. Relatives were responsible for 7% and college, commercial courses and organizations for 1.4% each. The educational system has been an important source of sewing information; however, recent trends suggest that this may be changing. A study involving 51 home sewers in Toronto was undertaken by students at the Ryerson Institute

in 1981. Sources of influence on sewing behavior determined from the study were:

Self instruction	80.4%
Mother	62.7%
School	58.7%
Friends	56.8%
Night school	39.2%
Sewing machine companies	27.5%
University courses	17.7%
Fabric store courses	15.6%

Conclusions of the Ryerson study indicate that the typical home sewer learned to sew in her teens and was influenced by her own experience and by her mother to a much greater extent than by the educational system. Although there are inherent limitations, the Ryerson study is a useful reference as it is one of few studies providing current information about Canadian home sewers.

Technology is providing home sewers with a new source of information which may serve to educate future sewers. A report from the *Canadian Home Sewing and Needlecraft Association* (Summer, 1983) described three new methods of communicating to home sewers:

1. Closed-circuit video seminars.
2. Series on the home television screen.
3. Education and promotion program of video cassettes for retail and other uses.

Retailers have indicated two major reasons for assuming a stronger role in educating the public. The first reason is decreased emphasis on sewing in the schools, and the second, reduced time available to working women to sew themselves or to pass on sewing skills ("Video sewing hits its stride," 1983). An increase in work force participation allows less time for both leisure and household related activities. As a result, it is not surprising that a common reason provided for not sewing, throughout the literature, is lack of time (Eggertson, 1982;"An exploratory study," 1981; Koontz, 1981).

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In this chapter the conceptual framework used for the study, method of investigation, sample selection, instrument development, methods of data collection and data analysis are described.

A. Conceptual Framework

The Home Production Activity Model, developed by Beutler and Owen (1980) was used as the conceptual framework for this study. The model characterizes the family as being the basic decisionmaking unit whose ultimate motivation is to meet the needs of individual members (Beutler & Owen, 1980). In order to meet needs, the family must choose among competing ends to maximize satisfactions, subject to limitations of scarce resources (Owen & Beutler, 1981). The home production activity model has three major components:

1. **The utility function**, involving Maslow's hierarchy of human needs (Maslow, 1968). The hierarchy categorizes wants and needs individuals seek to fulfill through social and economic activities. As needs are met, they give direct rise to satisfaction or utility. Unmet human needs give rise to dissatisfaction and disutility (Beutler & Owen, 1980).
2. **Maximization of utility** resulting from meeting human needs. Needs are met through outputs of home production activities which are divided into two categories: market participation and home production. Outputs from production activities are termed characteristics. The core of the production activity model, therefore, becomes an input (family resources) output (characteristics) model (Owen & Beutler, 1981).
3. **Inputs and outputs from home production and labor market** participation are outlined. The fundamental aspects of family preference and limited resources when combined, provide the characteristic bundle or optimal combination of abstract goods. The characteristic bundle represents the standard of living to be achieved.

The present level of living, however, represents characteristics already attained by the household. By comparing the present level of living to an established standard, the household uses a deficit approach to maximizing utility and meeting needs (Owen & Beutler, 1981).

Production activities involved in the Home Production Activity Model are divided into two categories: market production and home production. Exchange value or value within the formal money economy is a characteristic associated with market production, while home production is by and for household members. The output of home production has use value rather than exchange value. Traditionally models have given the household a consuming role and have proposed a choice between work and leisure. The concept of household as producer (Reid, 1934), however, allowed development of models involving household production and nonmarket activities (Beutler & Owen, 1980; Murphy, 1979; Volker, Winter & Beutler, 1983). Productive activities in the home, according to Reid (1934), included household crafts requiring manual labor.

Division of home production into two categories, separable and inseparable, provides a distinction between relationships involved in home production. Separable home production or household production is by and for household members and could be replaced by market goods or paid services. Both household and market production, however, may be intrahousehold (within the family unit), interhousehold (involves several households) or within the community (Beutler & Owen, 1980). Inseparable production is distinguished from separable home production because it is not market replaceable due to personal involvement.

Maximization of utility, the second component of the home production model, involves meeting needs through the output of home production activities. Output from the activities is in two potential forms: 1) extrinsic and 2) intrinsic. Extrinsic output is objective and universal. In other words, it is objectively measurable, external and independent in individual's perceptions and tastes (Beutler & Owen, 1980). Intrinsic output is non-universal and gives rise to utility or disutility (satisfaction or dissatisfaction). It also deals at the micro level with the individual and the family (Beutler & Owen, 1980).

The concept of household production provides a frame of reference which includes home sewing as an activity. There is, however, a gray area between household

work and leisure, which has been recognized by several authors (Murphy, 1979; Nickols & Metzen, 1978).

Although activities such as home sewing, gardening, woodwork and automotive repairs are encompassed by the household production model, problems have surfaced in other studies (Murphy, 1979; Nickols & Metzen, 1978) when creative, productive activities like sewing are assumed to be housework. It is for this reason, that the present study makes use of theory based in household production but remains open to sewing as a leisure activity as well.

B. Method

The design of the study was a two stage survey. The initial contact was made with a brief mailed questionnaire to a random sample of 1000 households within the city of Edmonton. The questionnaire was designed so that information could be obtained from both sewing and non-sewing households. A brief questionnaire was important so that households would not be discouraged from answering as this stage of the study also served to make contact with a home sewer who would hopefully participate in the second stage. The questionnaire was reduced to fit on one side of a four inch by six inch postcard (see Appendix A). The reverse side of the postcard contained the researcher's return address. Postage was prepaid on the postcards so that they could be returned by simply putting them in a mailbox. Included in the initial mailing with the postcard was a covering letter which explained the study and provided a definition of home sewing (see Appendix B). The voluntary nature of the study was emphasized and participants were ensured that responses would remain confidential. Approximately 2 1/2 weeks were allowed for response time. The covering letter also informed participants of a draw for several prizes. To further encourage the return of completed postcards, the draw was made prior to conducting the second stage of the study.

The second stage of the study involved participants from the first stage who met certain requirements, namely:

1. they were home sewers and
2. they agreed to participate in the second stage of the study.

Participants from Stage I who wished to continue with Stage II of the study provided their name and telephone number on the postcard. Information for Stage II was obtained from participants through a 20 to 25 minute telephone interview which dealt with sewing attitudes and activities (see Appendix C). Interviewers were trained to assist in conducting telephone interviews. All participants in the second stage of the study were eligible for a second prize draw upon completion of all of the telephone interviews.

Sample Selection

The study was designed to obtain current information about home sewing activities; however, information was also required to obtain an estimate of the percentage of sewers in the population. For this reason, a random sample of 1000 Edmonton residents was used.

The Population Research Lab within the Department of Sociology at the University of Alberta provided a random list of 1000 households within Edmonton.[1] The list consisted of addresses only; therefore, mail contact was made with the householder. If the respondent agreed to participate in Stage II of the study, the home sewer was asked to provide his or her name and a telephone number so that contact could be made for the telephone interview.

C. Instrument Development

Data were collected in two stages:

1. An initial questionnaire involving demographic characteristics of sewers and non-sewers was developed to provide general household information first, followed by more specific details from home sewers. The instrument was pretested on a number of students and faculty to encourage input regarding clarity of questions and use of the postcard format.
2. A detailed questionnaire involving sewing activities was developed in the form of a telephone interview as Stage II of the data collection process. The instrument was pretested for clarity of questions, coverage of sewing activities and logical

[1]Households were drawn randomly from the complete City of Edmonton spring 1983 census.

sequence of questions. Sewing satisfaction measures were also pretested to uncover potential problems with the use of a 5-point Likert scale. Trial telephone interviews were done to ensure that the time estimate given to Stage II participants was accurate.

Information obtained during pretesting was considered and changes were made to Stage I and Stage II instruments to obtain the best possible responses from participants. Responses to the postcard questionnaire (Stage I) necessitated the development of a revised telephone interview for non-sewers and one for home sewers who indulged in mending only. All instruments utilized were developed for this study.

Initial Questionnaire

The initial questionnaire was composed of two sections. The first section involving general household information was to be completed by the **householder** or **householders**. The second section of the initial questionnaire was to be completed by one of the **home sewers** in the household and involved general demographic information (see Appendix A).

The first section requested information about the number of people in the household, the number of sewers and their position within the household. Items related to number of children, the number of children living at home and the age of the youngest child were contained in the second question. Guidelines for questions in the first section came from several studies involving housework, time and household production which have suggested some useful types of demographic information to be collected. Walker and Woods, as reported in Proulx (1978), suggested that factors causing the amount of time devoted to housework activities to vary are the number of children in the family, age of the youngest child, and mother's work status outside the home. The importance of obtaining information about household size has been stressed by Owen and Beutler (1981) and Nickols and Metzen (1978) who then go on to include age of the youngest child, family income and occupations. If there were no home sewers in the household, after completion of the first section, the postcard was to be returned to the researcher.

If a home sewer was present in the household, then the second section of the postcard questionnaire could be completed. Questions included in this section involved

sex of the home sewer, age, marital status, employment, occupation and educational level. Age was requested in terms of five year categories ranging from 10 years to 65 years and over. Several questions involving employment status of home sewers were included to ascertain the number of home sewers employed outside the home, the time involved (part-time or full-time) and the approximate number of hours worked per week. Level of education was determined by requesting that home sewers indicate their highest level of education attained. Categories provided were:

1. some or all elementary education
2. some or all high school
3. some or all trade or technical school
4. some college or university
5. university degree(s).

The primary goal of this portion of the instrument was to provide a profile of the home sewer. Information regarding employment was also indicated by household production researchers to be of use in determining amount of time spent in household activities and satisfaction with housework (Ferree, 1976; Nickols & Metzen, 1978; Proulx, 1978). The final question on the postcard provided the respondent with the choice of ending participation in the study at that point or continuing on with the telephone interview. Because census information used to obtain the sample had provided addresses only, home sewers who wished to participate in the telephone interview were asked to provide a name and telephone number on the postcard so that they could be reached. To accommodate the participants and to facilitate the quick completion of the interviews, respondents were asked to indicate the best time of day to call (morning, afternoon or evening).

Telephone Interview

The items constituting the telephone questionnaire pertained to satisfaction with home sewing, sources of education for home sewers, the value of home sewing, reasons for sewing and sewing activities and attitudes (see Appendix C).

Satisfaction with clothing has been studied by several researchers and has frequently focused on wear, care, performance, fiber content, quality and quantity of

garments (Lowe & Dunsing, 1981; Ryan, 1954; Wall, 1974; Wall, Dickey & Talarzyk, 1978). No one method for measuring satisfaction has been found sufficient on its own; however, a combination of objective and subjective measures is considered to be more accurate (Lowe & Dunsing, 1981; Ryan, 1954; Wall, 1974). In light of the findings of the previous studies, satisfaction was measured in several ways in the present study. Frequency of wear or use of home sewing projects provided some information regarding satisfaction as did a satisfaction rating of the quality of home sewn projects on a 5-point Likert scale. Possible home sewing projects were divided into 14 categories including:

1. blouses / shirts
2. pants / skirts
3. day dresses
4. evening wear
5. suits / coats / jackets
6. crafts
7. toys
8. household items
9. children's clothing
10. lingerie / sleepwear
11. leisure, sports clothing
12. upholstery
13. draperies
14. other

Questions included how many of each of the 14 categories of sewing projects had been sewn in the past year, frequency of wear or use of the items and level of satisfaction with quality of the items. Frequency of wear or use involved a scale of frequently, sometimes, never, while satisfaction was scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied.

The same type of Likert scale was used to measure satisfaction with resources available to the home sewer and quality of home sewing projects. Resources included were patterns, fabrics, notions, time saving products and sewing information. Quality of home sewing products included the finished product, wear or use life of the product,

fit of garments and construction ability of the home sewer.

Sources of education for home sewers were examined in the study by allowing respondents to answer an open-ended question; where or from whom did you learn to sew? For ease of scoring, 14 sources of home sewing information were identified. Education sources included mothers, being self-taught, information from friends or relatives, home economics classes, continuing education classes and university clothing courses. Courses offered by sewing machine companies, fabric stores and district home economists were also included. Clubs such as 4H, books on sewing, pattern instructions and television sewing programs completed the list. Results of current Canadian studies have contributed to the sources identified ("An exploratory study," 1981; Eggertson, 1982).

The value of home sewing was determined by dividing sewing into three aspects:

1. number of hours required to complete the project
2. value of home sewers' sewing time in dollars per hour
3. cost of materials.

In order to obtain the most accurate assessment of the time and cost of materials involved in sewing, the respondent was asked to consider his or her most recent sewing project when responding. The value of a home sewn project, as determined by time spent, cost of materials and value of sewing time, was compared with the respondent's estimate of the retail price of a similar item.

Reasons for sewing were determined by providing the respondents with an opportunity to state why they sew. Home sewing researchers have provided some reasons for sewing; however, leisure studies and household production researchers have also identified reasons for participation in sewing activities. Reasons for participation in leisure (Hawes, Blackwell & Talarzyk, 1975), household production (Ferree, 1976) and home sewing ("An exploratory study," 1981; Eggertson, 1982), were combined and 16 reasons for sewing were identified for ease of scoring. Household production related reasons included: to economize, to obtain a better fit, to get better quality, to increase wardrobe size, to derive a sense of accomplishment, to obtain items which cannot be purchased, to provide for family members and to repair or alter. Leisure related reasons included: to relax, to be creative, to develop a skill, to obtain original items, to fill

spare time, to provide a challenge, to enjoy the activity and to express oneself. A maximum of five reasons were recorded; however, respondents were not required to rank reasons in order of importance.

Portions of the mailed questionnaire and the telephone interview were designed to obtain information about sewing activities and attitudes. Sewing activity information provided by the telephone questionnaire contributed to an extended profile of home sewers. Included were questions related to the number of years of sewing experience and the amount of sewing done as compared with five years previous. To determine the type of sewing done most frequently, respondents were asked to choose one of the following categories:

a. sewing for self

b. for family

c. for friends

d. for pay

e. household items

f. mending, alterations, repairs

g. other.

Similar categories were used by Spanovich (1982) to classify home sewers' activities. Respondents were asked if their sewing projects were undertaken more at certain times of the year and if so what season or holiday time. Time of day preferred for home sewing was also requested. Sources consulted for sewing information included salesclerks, home economists, sewing instructors, friends or relatives and books. Respondents indicated whether sources were consulted frequently, sometimes or never.

A question regarding family income levels of home sewers was included at the end of the telephone questionnaire. Responses provided additional demographic information to supplement the Stage I findings and served to expand the profile of home sewers. Family income level of home sewers was requested in terms of $5,000 categories ranging from under $9,999 per year to $60,000 per year and over.

A portion of the telephone interview was devoted specifically to sewing activities. Home sewers were asked to describe themselves as fast, moderate or slow sewers. Level of difficulty of projects selected was the focus of several questions about pattern

selection, pattern development and design details. Information regarding a further step in the pattern selection process, pattern alteration, was requested to ascertain if home sewers make alterations to purchased patterns to improve fit. If home sewers indicated that they altered patterns either sometimes or frequently, then specific alterations were requested. A list of possible alterations including length, hips, waist, bust, shoulders and arms was used for ease of scoring; however, respondents were encouraged to specify other alteration areas as well.

Mending is an area of home sewing often excluded from home sewing definitions. Included as a sewing activity in this study, mending, alterations and repairs were the focus of several questions aimed at time involved in these activities. Respondents were asked if they mended, repaired, or altered clothing or household textile products frequently, sometimes or never. In relation to other household tasks, home sewers were asked whether they would place a high, average or low priority on mending. If respondents indicated that they did mend at least sometimes, then an approximate number of hours per week spent mending, altering or repairing clothing or household textile items was requested. Although sewing activities performed within the home were of primary interest in the present study, a question was included to determine if any mending, repairing or altering of clothing or household textile products was performed by people outside the home.

A major objective of the study was to assess whether home sewing was perceived as a housework activity or a leisure activity by home sewers in the sample. Questions related to sewing as housework or leisure were placed at the end of the telephone interview so that respondents' sewing activities would be fresh in their minds, having just been discussed in the previous parts of the interview. Respondents were asked to consider their own sewing experience and state whether it represented:

1. a leisure activity,
2. a housework activity,
3. a combination of leisure and housework
4. or something else.

If home sewing represented a combination, the percentage of housework, leisure and/or other activity involved was requested.

D. Analysis of Data

Information involved in profiling the home sewer, including demographic data from Stage I and sewing background and attitudes from Stage II, was subjected to frequency counts, percentage distributions and calculation of means, where applicable. Data obtained from Stage II of the study which contributed to an extended profile of home sewers' sewing activities were also analyzed using frequencies and percentage distributions. Analysis of the profile and extended profile of the home sewer was designed to meet objective 1. Chi-square tests were utilized to compare characteristics of sewers and non-sewers.

Home sewers' perceptions of sewing as a housework activity or leisure activity (objective 2) were investigated using frequency and percentage distributions. The same approach was used to determine the percentage breakdown of home sewing as a combination of housework, leisure or other activity.

The level of satisfaction with home sewing expressed by the sample of sewers (objective 3), was determined by examining frequency and percentage distributions of responses for each of the satisfaction questions. Satisfaction measures were compared using Pearson product moment correlations. The nine satisfaction statements (telephone interview, question 25) were developed to measure satisfaction with quality of home sewing and satisfaction with resources available to the home sewer. A factor analysis was utilized to determine if relationships existed which would allow the data to be factored or grouped into quality or resources statements.

The value of home sewing was investigated in relation to the value of a purchased item (objective 5). T-tests were used to observe differences in means.

In order to test hypothesis 1, analysis of variance was used with each of the independent variables. Hypotheses 2 and 3 were tested by examining cross-tabulations and chi-square values. In each case a 0.05 level of significance was used.

IV. FINDINGS

A description of the sample, analysis of the variables and testing of the hypotheses are presented in this chapter. The level of significance for testing the hypotheses was set at 0.05.

A. Description of the Sample

Of the initial 1000 postcard questionnaires mailed to a random sample of households throughout the city of Edmonton, 194 were returned representing a 19.4% return rate. An additional 40 postcards were returned unopened due to vacancies, incorrect addresses and refusals.

Stage II of the data collection involved an in depth telephone interview about sewing activities and attitudes. Of the 194 postcard respondents, 122 agreed to participate in the telephone interview (62.9%) while 72 refused (37.1%). Home sewers accounted for 120 of the 122 participants, the remaining two being interested non-sewers. The total number of participants in Stage II was 107 as 13 respondents could not be contacted by telephone.

Non-Sewers

The non-sewers were unable to provide information appropriate for analysis in the present study, but because they had taken the time to respond and had expressed an interest in the study a revised telephone interview was used to collect some information. Specific points of interest were;

1. whether or not non-sewers have mending done outside the home.
2. if they had ever learned to sew and if so where or from whom.
3. reasons for not sewing.

B. Descriptive Analysis of the Variables - Stage I

Demographic Profile

Variables included in Stage I of the study provide some demographic information about respondents, and are described first. A descriptive analysis of Stage II home sewing variables follows this first description.

Initially, the reason for choosing a random sample of households rather than a sample consisting of home sewers only was to determine in what percentage of the Edmonton households there were sewers. From such information, comparisons between sewers and non-sewers in the sample would be possible. Of the 194 households who returned the postcard questionnaire, 181 households reported that someone in the household was a home sewer. The home sewing households represented 94.3% of the sample, however, current studies have suggested that home sewers represent a much smaller percentage of the population than is indicated here. In 1983, *Women's Wear Daily* suggested that active home sewers represented only 28% of the population (Brill, 1983). Comparisons between sewers and non-sewers were not possible in the present study due to the lack of representation of non-sewers and the high percentage of sewers represented in the sample.

Household size for the sample ranged from one person to seven people. Of the 181 households containing at least one home sewer, the largest percentage, 33.5%, were two person households. The number of sewers within a household ranged from one to four, with 76.8% of households having one home sewer present (Table 1). To obtain information about home sewers in general, the position of the home sewer within the household was requested. Respondents were asked to record all home sewers within the household using the categories male head of household, female head of household, daughter(s), son(s), roommate(s) or other. Exact numbers within each category were not requested. Households often contained more than one home sewer resulting in 180 households providing 218 responses to the question regarding position of sewers within the household. The majority of responses, 75.7%, indicated that the female head of household was a home sewer. The male head of household was a home sewer according to 10.1% of responses, daughter(s) in 6.4%, roommates in 4.1% and son(s) in

1.4% of the cases. The two groups which could be positively identified as being male home sewers were male heads of households and son(s). One or more sons may have been involved in sewing but the exact numbers were not requested. Within the 181 home sewing households, results suggest that at least 25 males were doing some home sewing.

Table 1. Home Sewing Households: Household Size and Number of Home Sewers per Household.

Household Size[a]	Percent	Number of Sewers[a] per Household	Percent
1	15.6	1	76.8
2	33.5	2	16.6
3	17.3	3	5.5
4	19.6	4	1.1
5	10.1		
6	3.4		
7	0.6		

[a] $n = 181$

In sewing households, the number of children in the household ranged from none to one household with 11 children. Approximately one-third (33.1%) of the sewing households had no children and 24.9% had two children. The mean number of children per sewing household for the sample was 1.7. The number of children living at home ranged from none to a maximum of nine children. Of the 121 respondents to the postcard questionnaire who had children, 26 (21.5%) had none of the children living at home with them. Thirty-two respondents (26.4%) had one child living at home and 40 (33.1%) had two children living at home. Households having two or fewer children living

at home accounted for 81.0% of the households with children (Table 2). Of the 121 home sewing households with children in the family, 119 responded to the question regarding age of the youngest child. Ages ranged from 2 weeks to 36 years with a mean age of approximately 12 years. The age of the youngest child occurring with the greatest frequency was five years (9.2%) (Table 3).

Table 2. Home Sewing Households: Number of Children at Home for Varying Family Sizes.

Children in Family	Children at Home										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
0	60										60
1	4	20								1*	25
2	4	6	35								45
3	7	4	3	16							30
4	5		2		4						11
5	1					1					2
6	5			1							6
7											0
8											0
9	1										1
10											0
11	1										1
Total	86	32	40	17	4	1	0	0	0	1	181

*Group Home with 8 Foster Children.

Table 3. Age of Youngest Child in 119 Home Sewing Households.

Age in Years	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1	9	7.2
1 - 5	36	30.1
6 - 10	14	11.7
11 - 15	19	15.9
16 - 20	16	13.5
21 - 25	10	8.3
26 - 30	11	9.3
Over 30	4	3.2

Information from Stage I, to this point, was provided by any member of the household. The remainder of the demographic information was provided by a home sewer within the household. The majority of home sewers responding were female (95.5%); however, eight male home sewers (4.5%) provided some information as well. Age of home sewers was requested in terms of five year categories ranging from under 16 years to over 65 years. Of 178 home sewers responding to the question, the largest percentage (21.9%) fell in the category 26 years to 30 years of age. No respondents were under 16 years of age. Marital status was indicated by 178 of the 181 home sewers. The greatest number of responding home sewers, (64.0%) were married, 16.9% were single and the remaining 19.2% were either divorced, widowed or in a category labeled other.

Responses from home sewers indicated that 64% of the sample were employed. Of the employed respondents 69.9% were employed part-time and 30.1% full-time. Part-time employment ranged from two hours per week to the level of full-time workers. Full-time employment in several cases exceeded the standard 40 hour week to a maximum of 80 hours per week. The 116 home sewers who provided a response for occupation

represented 50 different occupations of which the most common were nurses, managers, teachers and accounts clerks.

The highest level of education attained by home sewers was some or all high school in 31.1% of the cases. Almost 25% had some university education and 22.6% had a university degree or degrees. Some measure of technical school training was indicated by 17.0% of the sample. Overall, 46.9% of the sample had at least some university education (Table 4).

C. Descriptive Analysis of the Variables - Stage II

Home Sewing Activities

Stage II of the data collection, through the use of an in depth telephone questionnaire, provided information about sewers' attitudes and sewing activities. Of the 181 home sewers who responded to the postcard survey in Stage I, 120 agreed to participate in Stage II. A total of 107 home sewers responded to the Stage II telephone interview as 13 of the 120 home sewers could not be contacted by telephone. Two non-sewers also agreed to participate and were asked to respond to a revised questionnaire. Results from the two non-sewers, however, were not analyzed with other data collected from home sewers. Additional information for the profile of home sewing activities was obtained in the second stage.

Home sewers in the sample represented a range of sewing experience from 1 year to 50 years with a mean of 18.5 years of experience (Table 5). The modal value of 10 years represented the sewing experience time of 17.0% of the sample. The change in amount of sewing done compared with five years ago did not provide any definite pattern of sewing activity. Thirty-six of 106 respondents (34.0%) claimed to do the same amount of sewing as five years ago. Approximately one quarter, 27.4% claimed to do more sewing and 38.7% claimed to be doing less sewing than they did five years ago.

The type of sewing done most frequently by respondents was mending in 35.8% of cases. Sewing for self or for family members was done most frequently in 27.4% of cases each. Only one respondent indicated that she sewed primarily for pay, while two

Table 4. Stage I Respondents: Home Sewers' Age, Marital Status and Education.

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Age in Years[a]		
Under 16	0	0.0
16 - 20	6	3.4
21 - 25	25	14.0
26 - 30	39	21.9
31 - 35	24	13.5
36 - 40	24	13.5
41 - 45	14	7.9
46 - 50	9	5.1
51 - 55	13	7.3
56 - 60	9	5.1
61 - 65	7	3.9
Over 65	8	4.5
Marital Status[a]		
Married	114	64.0
Single	30	16.9
Widowed	17	9.6
Divorced	11	6.2
Other	6	3.4
Education[b]		
Some or all Elementary	9	5.1
Some or all High School	55	31.1
Some Trade or Technical School	12	6.8
Trade or Technical Diploma	18	10.2
Some University	43	24.3
University Degree(s)	40	22.6

[a] $n = 178$

[b] $n = 177$

Table 5. Years of Sewing Experience.

Years of Experience[a]	Percent	Experience cont'd.	Percent
1	0.9	20	14.2
2	2.8	23	0.9
3	0.9	25	4.7
4	1.9	26	1.9
5	2.8	28	0.9
6	2.8	30	5.7
7	2.8	32	0.9
10	17.0	35	1.9
11	3.8	36	0.9
13	3.8	39	0.9
14	0.9	40	1.9
15	11.3	45	3.8
17	1.9	48	0.9
18	3.8	50	1.9
19	0.9		

[a] $n = 106$

people sewed for friends and three people sewed household items most frequently (Table 6).

The majority of home sewers in the sample, 86.5%, said that they undertook sewing projects more at certain times of the year than at other times. The 77 home sewers who did sew more at certain times of the year did not necessarily choose one season only and as a result 136 responses were recorded. The times of the year home sewers were most likely to indulge in sewing activities were winter (36.8% of responses), fall (25.7%), spring (22.1%), summer (12.5%) and finally holidays with 2.9% of responses. Eighty-eight of the responding home sewers indicated that they undertook sewing

Table 6. Type of Sewing Done Most Frequently.

Type of Sewing[a]	Percent
Mending, Alterations, Repairs	35.8
For Self	27.4
For Family	27.4
Household Items	2.8
For Friends	1.9
For Pay	0.9
Other	3.8

[a] $\underline{n}$ = 106

projects at certain times of the day. Once again more than one response was possible if home sewers chose to sew at various times throughout the day. The majority of home sewers in the sample (59.6%) sewed during the evening while 18.3% sewed in the morning, 17.4% in the afternoon and 4.6% sewed at night, from midnight to six a.m.

Consulting an outside source or sources for information on how to sew with selected projects was practiced by 54 of 89 responding home sewers (60.7%). Of those home sewers who did consult outside sources, the most frequently used information source was a friend or relative who was sometimes or frequently consulted by 85.2% of respondents. Books were consulted sometimes or frequently by a total of 55.5% of the respondents. Salesclerks, sewing instructors and home economists were least likely to be consulted for sewing information (Table 7).

Table 7. Outside Sources of Sewing Information Consulted by 54 Home Sewers.

Source	Percentage of Respondents		
	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
Friend or Relative	33.3	51.9	14.8
Books	25.9	29.6	44.4
Sales Clerk	9.3	31.5	59.3
Sewing Instructor	1.9	18.5	79.6
Home Economist	1.9	11.1	87.0

Many sources of sewing education are available to home sewers and often skills are developed through a variety of experiences. To determine where home sewers learned their skills, respondents were not limited in the number of responses that could be given resulting in 107 home sewers providing 253 sources of sewing education. The most frequently cited source of sewing education was home economics classes. Sixty-six respondents (61.7% of cases) listed home economics classes in school as a source of sewing education. Mothers were responsible for the sewing education of 52 respondents (48.6% of cases), 28.0% felt that they were self-taught and 20.6% learned to sew through courses offered by fabric stores. College or university courses accounted for 6.5% of education sources for home sewers (Table 8).

Reasons for sewing were scored in much the same manner as source of home sewing education. Respondents were not limited in the number of responses that could be given; however, a maximum of five responses was coded for each case. The total number of responses from 106 home sewers was 334, an average of approximately three reasons per respondent. The most common reason for sewing, indicated by

Table 8. Useful Sources of Home Sewers' Sewing Education.

Source	Frequency[a]	% Responses	% Cases
Home Economics Class	66	26.1	61.7
Mother	52	20.6	48.6
Self-taught	30	11.9	28.0
Fabric Store Courses	22	8.7	20.6
Evening/Continuing Education Courses	18	7.1	16.8
Friends or Relatives	17	6.7	15.9
Sewing Books	16	6.3	15.0
Pattern Instructions	8	3.2	7.5
College or University	7	2.8	6.5
Sewing Machine Company Courses	6	2.4	5.6
4H or other Clubs	1	0.4	0.9
Television Sewing Programs	1	0.4	0.9
Others	9	3.6	8.4

Note. Number of cases = 107

[a] Number of responses = 253

69.8% of cases, was to economize. Enjoyment of sewing was indicated as a reason for sewing by 53.8% of cases while sewing for necessity because items could not be purchased was listed by 29.2% of home sewers. Other reasons given for sewing listed in decreasing order of importance were: to obtain better quality items, better fit, as a sense of achievement or accomplishment, to repair or alter, to obtain original items, to relax, as a creative outlet, or to fill spare time. Sewing for a challenge, to increase a wardrobe, as a means of self expression, to provide for family members and sewing to develop skills were also mentioned (Table 9).

The final variable aimed at profiling home sewers was income. Ninety home sewers provided information about family income level which ranged from under $10,000 per year to $60,000 per year and over. The largest percentage of respondents, 14.4% had household incomes ranging from $35,000 to $39,999 per year. Fifty percent of responding households earned less than $30,000 per year. The most common reason for sewing according to home sewers in the sample has been identified as sewing to economize or to save money. Stated income categories of those homesewers who sewed to economize were investigated. Results showed that almost one quarter of sewers who sewed to economize earned less than $15,000 per year. Fifty-four percent earned less than $30,000 per year, however, approximately 20% of economy sewers fell into categories $30,000 to $40,000 per year (Table 10).

Extended Home Sewing Activities

Additional Stage II variables provided information about specific sewing activities and were analyzed as an extended profile of home sewers. For the purpose of the study, home sewing was defined neither as a housework nor leisure activity as home sewers' input was required to determine which category was most appropriate. Responses to a question regarding priority placed on home sewing in relation to other household tasks revealed that of 105 home sewers, 39 (37.1%) gave it low priority, 52 sewers (49.5%) average priority and 14 (13.3%) gave home sewing high priority. The priority placed on sewing was also tested for correlation with home sewers' views on sewing as a housework or leisure activity. The Spearman correlation indicated that the two were not significantly correlated.

Table 9. Home Sewers' Reasons for Sewing.

Reasons	Frequency[a]	% Responses	% Cases
Economize	74	22.2	69.8
Enjoyment of Sewing	57	17.1	53.8
Necessary - Can't Purchase	31	9.3	29.2
Better Quality	21	6.3	19.8
Obtain Better Fit	20	6.0	18.9
Achievement or Accomplishment	19	5.7	17.9
Repair or Alter	14	4.2	13.2
Obtain Original Item	14	4.2	13.2
To Relax	12	3.6	11.3
Creative Outlet	12	3.6	11.3
Fill Spare Time	12	3.6	11.3
Challenge	3	0.9	2.8
Increase Wardrobe	3	0.9	2.8
Self Expression	2	0.6	1.9
Provide for Family	1	0.3	0.9
Develop Skill	1	0.3	0.9
Others	38	11.4	35.9

Note. Number of cases = 106

[a] Number of responses = 334

Table 10. Household Income of Home Sewers and of Respondents Who Sew to Economize.

Income Level in Dollars	Household Income	Economizing Sewers' Income
	Frequency	Frequency
Under 10,000	9	6
10,000 - 14,999	8	8
15,000 - 19,999	11	6
20,000 - 24,999	8	7
25,000 - 29,999	9	7
30,000 - 34,999	7	6
35,000 - 39,999	13	7
40,000 - 44,999	5	3
45,000 - 49,999	7	4
50,000 - 54,999	6	3
55,000 - 59,999	0	0
60,000 and Over	7	6
Total	90	74

Specific sewing activities included the types of projects undertaken as well as the relative speed with which sewing was done. Approximately 50% of home sewers viewed themselves as moderate sewers while 30.7% viewed themselves as fast and the remaining 17% as slow sewers. Level of difficulty of projects undertaken was investigated by determining first whether or not projects undertaken were selected on the basis of not taking a great amount of time to complete. Approximately two-thirds of sewers did select projects on that basis at least sometimes. The same percentage of

home sewers also selected the "Fast & Easy" and "See 'n Sew" type patterns at least some of the time. Patterns which required more detail were selected frequently by 18.6% of the sample, selected sometimes by 51.2% and never by 30.2% of home sewers. In addition to home sewing with a pattern, approximately 45% of the respondents indicated that they developed their own patterns at least sometimes while 55.1% of home sewers never developed their own patterns (Table 11).

Table 11. Home Sewers' Pattern Choices, Pattern Development and Use of Special Considerations and Time Saving Techniques.

Sewing Activity	n	Frequency of Choice		
		Frequently %	Sometimes %	Never %
Project Selection Quick	89	37.1	31.5	31.5
Pattern Selection Easy	88	26.1	42.0	31.8
Pattern Selection Detailed	86	18.6	51.2	30.2
Develop Own Patterns	89	15.7	29.2	55.1
Use of Special Considerations	88	23.9	36.4	39.8
Use of Shortcuts	88	26.1	42.0	31.8

Special techniques used in the construction process such as special considerations for working with fabrics (preshrinking, layout, cutting, sewing or pressing techniques) were used frequently by 23.9% of sewers, sometimes by 36.4% and never by 39.8% of home sewers. Time saving or shortcut techniques were used by about two-thirds of home sewers either sometimes or frequently (Table 11). Although 13 of 89 home sewers reported that they never made alterations to purchased patterns, the remaining 85% of sewers made alterations at least some of the time. Home sewers were encouraged to indicate all areas where alterations were made resulting in multiple

responses being recorded for many participants in the interview. Specific garment alterations most frequently made were with regard to length in 78.9% of cases. Some alterations were made to the hip area in 46.1% of cases, to the waist in 44.7% and to bust, shoulders or arms in 27.6% of cases (Table 12).

Table 12. Alterations Made by Home Sewers.

Variable	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
Alterations Made[a]	48.3%	37.1%	14.6%
Location of Alteration[b]	**Frequency**	**% Responses**	**% Cases**
Length	60	29.1	78.9
Hips	35	17.0	46.1
Waist	34	16.5	44.7
Bust	21	10.2	27.6
Shoulder	21	10.2	27.6
Arms	21	10.2	27.6
All Others	14	6.8	18.4

[a] $n = 89$

[b] $n = 76$

Note. Number of responses = 203

Specific types of home sewing projects were grouped into 13 categories plus a category for miscellaneous and other items to determine:

1. what sort of items respondents were sewing,
2. how frequently they were being sewn,
3. number of items sewn within the past year,
4. how frequently the projects were worn or used.

Home sewers responded frequently, sometimes or never to a question involving how frequently they sewed each of the categories of home sewing projects. Combining scores for frequently and sometimes constructed, categories were ranked in order from most popular sewing projects to least popular. Pants/skirts were most popular with 95.5% of sewers having made items in this category at least sometimes. Day dresses were made frequently or sometimes by 88.7% of the sample. Blouses/shirts were constructed at least sometimes by 84.1%. Craft items were made by 74.7% of the sample and household items by 65.9% at least sometimes. The remainder of the categories in order were: children's wear, leisure wear, draperies, toys, suits/coats/jackets, lingerie, evening wear and upholstery. The least frequently constructed sewing projects, upholstery items, were never constructed by 78.4% of sewers (Table 13).

The previous section dealt with frequency of construction of items in the project categories. If a home sewer indicated making items within a category either sometimes or frequently, then he or she was asked to estimate the number of items sewn in that category during the previous year. The total number of items sewn or volume of sewing was calculated by summing the number produced in each category. The total number of items constructed ranged from zero to 257 projects. Approximately half of the sample had constructed fewer than 25 projects in the one year period. The mean for the number of projects made was 35.8 and the mode was ten. Respondents had previously ranked themselves as fast, moderate or slow sewers. A crosstabulation of total number of projects constructed in one year by sewing speed (fast, moderate or slow), showed that 34 of 46 moderate sewers made between 1 and 30 projects in the one year. Eighteen of the 27 fast sewers made more than 36 projects and approximately one half of slow sewers made fewer than 20 projects.

Table 13. Home Sewing Projects: Frequency of Construction by Category.

Category	Percentage of Respondents		
	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
Pants/Skirts	45.5	50.0	4.5
Day Dresses	36.4	52.3	11.4
Blouses/Shirts	31.8	52.3	15.9
Crafts	42.5	32.2	25.3
Household Items	15.9	50.0	34.1
Children's Wear	34.5	29.9	35.6
Leisure Wear	13.6	47.7	38.6
Drapes	3.4	53.4	43.2
Toys	19.3	36.4	44.3
Suits/Coats/Jackets	9.1	43.2	47.7
Lingerie	5.7	40.9	53.4
Evening Wear	4.5	35.2	60.2
Upholstery	0.0	21.6	78.4

The third question asked with regard to the 13 home sewing project categories was how often the items were worn or used. Possible responses for this question were frequently, sometimes or never. Respondents had also been asked how frequently their home sewing in general was worn or used. Scores for the three most popular project categories, namely, pants/skirts, day dresses and blouses/shirts were compared with frequency of wear or use of home sewing projects in general. Significant correlations were found at the .05 level between general frequency of wear or

use of home sewing projects and frequency of wear or use of day dresses r (n=56) = .28, p = .02, and of blouses/shirts r (n=61) = .36, $p < .01$. Home sewing products in general were worn or used a great deal according to respondents. Sixty-nine of 88 home sewers (78.4%) claimed that their home sewing products were worn or used frequently. One home sewer never wore or used his or her projects.

The final area of interest in an extended profile of sewing activities was whether or not home sewers complete the projects they start. Responses to the question regarding completion of all items sewn within the year showed that 60.2% of home sewers in the sample completed all items started.

Mending Activities

The one type of sewing undertaken most frequently by home sewers in 35.8% of the cases was mending, altering or repairing. Average priority was given to mending activities in relation to other household tasks by about 50% of home sewers while 18.4% gave mending high priority and 32% of sewers gave it low priority. When questioned about priority given to sewing in general about 50% of participants also gave sewing average priority in relation to other household tasks. Responses to a question on frequency of mending, repairing or altering clothing or household products ranged from frequently to never. A total of 98.1% of respondents mended items sometimes or frequently. Two home sewers claimed that they never mend, repair or alter clothing or household items (Table 14). The home sewers who participated in mending activities were asked to estimate the number of hours per week spent mending, repairing or altering. Responses ranged from one or two minutes to a maximum of ten hours per week (Table 15).

A viable option for sewers and non-sewers is to have mending, alterations and repairs done by someone else, outside the home. Results showed that 72.9% of the home sewers in the sample never have mending done outside the home while 25.2% have mending done by someone outside the household some of the time (Table 14).

Table 14. Home Sewers' Mending Activities: Frequency, Priority Placed on Mending and Mending Performed Outside the Household.

Mending Activities	n	High %	Average %	Low %
Priority	103	18.4	49.5	32.0
		Frequently %	Sometimes %	Never %
Mending Frequency	88	50.9	47.2	1.9
Mending Performed Outside the Household	107	1.9	25.2	72.9

Table 15. Time Spent in Mending Activities by 101 Home Sewers.

Time per Week	Percent
Under 30 minutes	21.4
30 minutes	21.4
45 minutes	2.9
1 hour	25.2
2 hours	15.5
3 hours	4.9
4 hours	2.9
5 hours or more	4.0

Satisfaction with Home Sewing

The level of satisfaction experienced by home sewers was measured in several ways throughout the telephone questionnaire in Stage II of the study. Based on the assumption that home sewers would tend to wear or use products of their home sewing activities if satisfied with their efforts, a variable was included regarding frequency of wear or use. Responses indicated that on average, products of home sewing activities were worn or used sometimes by 20.5% of home sewers and were worn or used frequently by 78.4%. The indirect approach to measuring satisfaction was once again used with regard to the 13 home sewing project categories discussed previously in the section dealing with extended home sewing activities. Frequency of wear or use of items constructed in the previous one year period were determined. Responses to frequency of wear or use for the most frequently sewn project categories, pants/skirts, day dresses and blouses/shirts, were then compared with frequency of wear or use scores for home sewing projects in general. Significant correlations at the .05 level were reported previously between general home sewing scores and wear or use of blouses/shirts and with wear or use of day dresses. Generally home sewers in the sample were satisfied enough with projects to have worn or used them frequently.

A direct measure of satisfaction with home sewing was used to assess level of satisfaction with projects. A 5-point Likert type scale ranging from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied provided an indicator of satisfaction for each of the 13 categories of home sewing projects plus a category for other items, making the total 14 categories. A satisfaction score for each project category, however, was difficult to use for comparison and was not as meaningful as an overall score. A new variable was computed after the data collection process had been completed, which provided an overall score for satisfaction with the quality of home sewing projects. For each case, satisfaction scores for individual project categories were summed. The total was then divided by the number of contributing categories to produce an average satisfaction score. Frequency and percent distributions of the average satisfaction scores showed that the minimum score for the sample of home sewers was 3, which on the satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale indicated neutrality. Due to the averaging, scores became continuous rather than discrete. The range was 3 to 5 on the 5-point scale with

scores falling along a continuum. Generally speaking, according to this measure the sample of home sewers was satisfied with projects.

A second direct measure of satisfaction with home sewing was used to assess level of satisfaction with home sewing in general, with resources and supplies available to home sewers and with quality of products in general (see Appendix C). The nine questions measuring these areas of satisfaction were used in a factor analysis to determine if relationships existed so that the data could be rearranged into components or factors (Table 16). Results of the factor analysis defined two components or factors. Factor one included the following satisfaction questions involving level of satisfaction with:

1. Home sewing in general.
2. The professional look of a garment, craft item or household textile sewn.
3. Home sewer's ability to make a quality item.
4. Wear or use life of a home sewn item.
5. Fit of garments sewn at home.

Factor two included questions regarding level of satisfaction with:

1. Patterns available to the home sewer.
2. The variety of fabrics and notions available to the home sewer.
3. Sewing information available to the home sewer.
4. Convenient and time saving products available to home sewers.

For the remainder of the data analysis involving satisfaction scores, scores for factor one variables were summed and the average taken to produce a **quality** factor. Scores for factor two variables were summed and the average taken to produce a **resource** factor. The scores for the level of satisfaction determined by the quality factor ranged from 3 to 5. The possible range of scores on the satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale was 1 to 5. The mid value or neutral point of the scale was three, the minimum level of satisfaction as determined by the quality factor. The possible range of scores for the resource factor was also 1 to 5 (very dissatisfied to very satisfied). Resource factor scores, however, ranged from slightly less than 3 to 5. The neutral point being three, the majority of respondents were not dissatisfied with resources available to home sewers (93.1%) (Table 17). In six cases of a possible 87, respondents were somewhat dissatisfied with

Table 16. Rotated Factor Loading for Each Satisfaction Variable Within the Assigned Factor.

Satisfaction Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2
General Home Sewing	0.702	
Professional Look	0.754	
Ability	0.834	
Wear or Use-life	0.555	
Fit of Home Sewing	0.563	
Patterns Available		0.498
Fabrics and Notions		0.756
Sewing Information		0.767
Convenient Products		0.868
Eigenvalue	2.713	1.946
% Total Variance	30.1	21.6

resources available to home sewers.

Quality and resource factor scores were also used to determine if a significant relationship existed between average level of satisfaction with projects and the quality and resource factors. The calculated Pearson product moment correlation coefficient indicated a significant correlation at the .05 level between average satisfaction with projects and satisfaction with quality of home sewing r (n=86) = .46, $p < .01$, and between average satisfaction with projects and satisfaction with resources available to home sewers r (n=81) = .29, p = .01. The level of satisfaction home sewers experience with the quality of the projects they make, specifically and in general appeared to be similar. Level of satisfaction with resources available to home sewers was generally somewhat lower but still consistent with home sewers' overall level of

Table 17. Amount of Satisfaction with Quality of Products and Resource Availability.

Amount of Satisfaction		Percent	Cumulative Percent
Quality of Products[a]			
3.00	(Neutral)	2.2	2.2
3.20		3.3	5.5
3.40		5.5	11.0
3.60		11.0	22.0
3.80		6.6	28.6
4.00	(Satisfied)	16.5	45.1
4.20		18.7	63.8
4.40		13.2	77.0
4.60		8.8	85.8
4.80		5.5	91.3
5.00	(Very Satisfied)	8.8	100.0
Resources Available[b]			
2.25		2.3	2.3
2.75		4.6	6.9
3.00	(Neutral)	4.6	11.5
3.25		9.2	20.7
3.50		14.9	35.6
3.75		6.9	42.5
4.00	(Satisfied)	20.7	63.2
4.25		14.9	78.1
4.50		2.3	80.4
4.75		5.7	86.2
5.00	(Very Satisfied)	13.8	100.0

[a] $\underline{n} = 91$

[b] $\underline{n} = 87$

satisfaction. All measures of home sewers' level of satisfaction provided fairly high scores indicating that the respondents were generally satisfied with home sewing projects, quality of home sewing and resources available to home sewers.

Value of Home Sewing

To determine the value home sewers perceived their projects to have, several questions were asked. In many cases, a great number of projects had been completed within the space of a year by home sewers. To make questions regarding the value of home sewing more meaningful, responses were confined to the home sewer's most recently completed project. Forty-four different items were listed including many craft and home decorating projects in addition to garments. An estimate of the number of hours required to complete the project was also requested. Sewing time varied from a few minutes to a maximum of 80 hours per project. Approximately 80% of respondents estimated that their last project required ten hours or less to complete. The following question dealt with value of sewing time and requested that home sewers estimate the value of their sewing time in dollars per hour. In general, respondents experienced great difficulty in placing a monetary value on their time; however, 57 home sewers managed to do so. The minimum value recorded was $3.00 per hour and the maximum, $24.00 per hour. About 20% valued their time at $10.00 per hour while another 14% valued it at $7.00 per hour (Table 18). The cost of materials used in the project was the subject of the next question resulting in a range from $.17 to $350.00. If respondents thought it possible to purchase an item similar to the one sewn, then an estimate of the retail price was requested. Fifty-three percent said that a similar product could be purchased while 47% said it could not. Retail price estimates ranged from $4.00 to $350.00.

If the value assigned to home sewing is represented by the cost of materials only, then results of a t-test using cost of materials and retail prices indicate that a significant difference exists at the .05 level between the value placed on home sewing and the perceived value of a retail item $t(43) = -5.07$, $p < .01$. The value assigned to home sewn items is significantly less than that given to similar retail items. The value of a home sewn

Table 18. Estimated Value/Hour of Time Spent Sewing by 57 Home Sewers.

Value/Hour[a]	Frequency	Value/Hour cont'd.	Frequency
$3.00	2	$ 8.50	1
3.65	1	10.00	12
4.00	2	11.00	1
4.50	2	12.00	2
5.00	9	13.00	1
5.50	1	14.00	1
6.00	6	15.00	2
7.00	8	20.00	1
7.50	1	24.00	1
8.00	3		

product was calculated in the following manner when a value for sewing time was included.

Value of Home Sewn Product = value of sewing time ($/hour) x number of hours required to complete project + cost estimate of materials.

Once value is given to a home sewer's time, the value of a home sewn product becomes significantly greater than that of a similar retail item $t(27) = 2.30$, $p = .03$.

Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure

Home sewers in the sample were asked to indicate whether home sewing represented a leisure activity, housework, a combination of leisure and housework or something else. A frequency and percentage distribution of responses showed that of 106 responses, 41 home sewers viewed sewing as a leisure activity (38.7%) and another 41, viewed it as a combination of housework and leisure. Ten respondents (9.4%) saw sewing as housework and the remaining 14 saw it as something else entirely. The 41 home sewers who viewed home sewing as a combination further divided the combination activity into percentage housework, percentage leisure, and/or percentage other. A

50% leisure and 50% housework combination was chosen most frequently, by 36% of respondents who viewed sewing as a combination activity. One home sewer chose something other than housework or leisure to make up 25% of the combination activity (Table 19).

Table 19. Percentage of Home Sewing Time Considered to be Housework, Leisure Activity and Other Activities.

Percentage Contributions			
Housework	Leisure	Other	Frequency
10	90		3
15	60	25	1
20	80		2
25	75		1
30	70		4
40	60		5
50	50		15
50	40		3
75	25		4
80	20		2
85	15		1

D. Testing of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a:

A significant difference exists between sewer's satisfaction with home sewing and reasons for sewing.

Home sewers responded to an open ended question regarding reasons for sewing and, as

a result provided a number of reasons in many cases. The three most frequently mentioned reasons for sewing were chosen for analysis; however, a great deal of overlap in groups occurred. Analysis of variance requires that unique groups be used for analysis. When respondents were divided into unique groups based on reason for sewing (sews to economize but not for enjoyment or necessity), the sample size became too small to test the hypothesis accurately. Descriptive analysis of satisfaction was based on average product satisfaction scores as calculated by adding satisfaction scores for each project completed, and dividing by the number of different projects. Quality satisfaction was also studied involving the statements making up the quality factor. Reasons for sewing included sewing to economize, enjoyment of sewing and sewing out of necessity due to inability to purchase an item. These were the three most frequently mentioned reasons for sewing by the respondents. Level of satisfaction for the sample was generally high. Home sewers who sewed to economize were generally not dissatisfied with the quality of their projects. The minimum level of satisfaction reported for this group was 3 (neutral) on the satisfied-dissatisfied scale. Forty percent of the group scored on a continuum between neutral (3) and satisfied (4) while the remaining 60% scored between satisfied (4) and very satisfied (5). Ten respondents (15%) were very satisfied with project quality. Very similar results occurred when quality factor scores were analyzed for the home sewers who sew to economize. Quality scores included satisfaction with the professional look of a home sewn item, ability to make a quality home sewn item, wear or use life of projects, fit of garments and home sewing in general. The largest percentage of responses were grouped at the satisfied level (40%) and no sewers indicated that they were dissatisfied with aspects making up the quality factor.

Home sewers who sewed for enjoyment of the activity were analyzed in the same manner as economy sewers. Once again, these sewers were quite satisfied with products made, the minimum score being slightly above the neutral point. A larger percentage were very satisfied with projects sewn (20%) while about 60% were in the satisfied range. Almost 80% of the sample who sewed for enjoyment were at least satisfied with projects sewn. Results of satisfaction as determined by the quality factor were very similar as almost 80% of the sewers were at least satisfied with quality,

although only 11% were very satisfied.

Home sewers who chose necessity (items could not be purchased) as a reason for sewing scored a minimum of 3.5 on the average product satisfaction continuum, midway between neutral and satisfied with projects. This minimum level is somewhat higher than for the other two groups of sewers. Approximately 25% of necessity sewers were satisfied (4) with projects and two respondents were very satisfied (5). Scores for quality satisfaction were much the same with the majority grouped around the satisfied level. In summary, home sewers were generally satisfied with projects and quality regardless of their reasons for sewing. Slightly more of the home sewers who sewed for enjoyment of the activity were very satisfied with projects and quality than the other groups; however, any trends must be viewed with caution.

Hypothesis 1b:

A significant difference exists between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity.

A one way analysis of variance was used to test the null hypothesis that no significant difference exists between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity. The analysis produced no significant difference in level of satisfaction among groups based on perception of sewing as housework, leisure, or a combination of the two. Based on these results, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Hypothesis 1c:

A significant difference exists between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and demographic characteristics of home sewers.

Analysis of variance was used to test the null hypothesis that no significant difference exists between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and demographic characteristics of home sewers. Demographic variables used were number of children, number of children at home, age of the youngest child, age of the home sewer, marital status,

education level, employment status and income. Several of the demographic variables were recoded or collapsed to provide more meaningful categories for significance testing. Data collected on number of children in the household initially provided a wide range of family size. Households having three or more children were collapsed to one category for the purpose of analysis. Households with children had responded to a question regarding number of children at home. Data for number of children at home were collapsed in the same manner as data for the number of children in a family. Responses to the age of the youngest child question provided a range from 2 weeks old to 36 years. For the purpose of analysis, children were divided into pre-school and school age and older. Categories were collapsed to children five years of age and younger, and over five years. To ensure that sufficient responses were contained in each category for the purpose of analysis, age categories for home sewers were collapsed to span 10 years each (16 - 25 years, 26 - 35 years). Income levels were also collapsed so that categories became $10,000 - $19,999, $20,000 - $29,999, $30,000 - $39,999, etc. No significant differences in sewers' satisfaction levels were found among any of the groups formed by the demographic characteristics listed, thus the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Hypothesis 1d:

A significant difference exists between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and types of items sewn.

Home sewing projects were categorized to provide 13 possible types of sewn items. Responses indicated that three categories of projects were sewn at least sometimes, by 84% or more of the responding sewers. Home sewers' activities were not limited to one type of project only and as a result many sewers constructed items in each of the project categories; pants/skirts, day dresses and blouses/shirts. As was the case in hypothesis 1a, sewers could not be grouped on the basis of the items sewn for an analysis of variance and hypothesis 1d could not be tested. Descriptive analysis of satisfaction with the types of items sewn follows. Home sewers who constructed pants or skirts at least sometimes were generally very satisfied with their products. On

the 5-point Likert scale, the minimum value scored for the group was 3 (neutrality). Approximately 15% of the sewers were satisfied with products while almost 17% were very satisfied. More than 70% of the pants/skirts sewers were at least satisfied with their projects. Similar results were obtained from the quality satisfaction scale, although fewer sewers were very satisfied in this instance. The group of home sewers who constructed day dresses at least sometimes obtained very similar results on product satisfaction to the pants/skirts group. A minimum level of 3 (neutrality) was recorded. Seventy-five percent of the group was at least satisfied with products with 14% scoring a level of 4 (satisfied) and the remainder ranging between 4 and 5 on the scale. Approximately 18% were very satisfied. Quality satisfaction, as for the previous group of sewers was also high, although fewer sewers (9%) were very satisfied with the quality of their work. The third group of sewers who constructed blouses or shirts at least some of the time, obtained scores ranging from neutral to very satisfied with products. Once again about 75% were at least satisfied with products and approximately 15% were very satisfied. Quality satisfaction also ranged from neutral to very satisfied with the majority of the group around the satisfied level. Generally the level of satisfaction was high for all groups and scores appeared to change little among the groups.

Hypothesis 1e:

A significant difference exists between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and sources of home sewing education.

Responses to an open ended question regarding where home sewers learned their skills indicated that at least 20% of home sewers had learned their skills from one or more of the following sources; home economics classes in school, mothers or self-instruction. If more than one source was chosen, overlap in groups based on source of sewing education could not be eliminated. Thus analysis of variance was not possible to test hypothesis 1e. Descriptive analysis of satisfaction among sewers who chose the three sources of education; home economics classes, mothers or self-instruction, shows that of respondents choosing the three sources of education, approximately 5% of each group were somewhat dissatisfied with home sewing in general. Groups formed on each of

the sources of sewing education were approximately equal with respect to the percentage of the group stating a satisfaction level of satisfied with home sewing. Approximately 50% of the group was satisfied in each case. An additional 25% of home sewers who learned to sew from either their mother or in home economics classes were very satisfied with sewing and 35% of those who were self-taught were very satisfied.

Hypothesis 2a:

A significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and reasons for sewing.

Perception of home sewing by home sewers in the sample could not be classified as simply housework or leisure. Approximately 38% of respondents viewed home sewing as a combination of housework and leisure. In most cases the combination provided by respondents was 50% housework and 50% leisure. These results provided a rationale for the use of three categories: housework, leisure and combination to define perception of home sewing. Crosstabs were used to investigate perception of sewing and the three major reasons for sewing: to economize, for enjoyment of the activity and for necessity. Chi-square values were used to test the null hypothesis that no significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and reasons for sewing. No significant associations exist between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and the reason for sewing, to economize. Neither do significant associations exist between perception of home sewing and the reason for sewing, necessity. A significant association exists between perception of home sewing and sewing for enjoyment of the activity (Table 20). Associated statistics such as Cramer's V which indicate degree of association provided a low value (0.27). The nature of the association cannot be determined on the basis of the statistical tests; however, home sewers who perceived sewing to be a leisure activity were more likely to sew for enjoyment than were home sewers who perceived sewing as housework or as a combination of housework and leisure. The null hypothesis was rejected based on the findings and the alternate hypothesis 2a accepted.

Table 20. Chi-Square Analysis of Association of Reasons for Sewing with Perception of Sewing as Housework or Leisure.

Reason for Sewing	Chi-Square	d.f.	Significance
Sewing to Economize	0.01	2	0.99
Sewing for Enjoyment	6.70	2	0.04*
Sewing for Necessity	0.76	2	0.68

*$p < .05$.

Hypothesis 2b:

A significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and demographic characteristics of the home sewers.

Demographic variables tested were number of children, number of children at home, age of the youngest child, age of home sewer, marital status, employment status, type of employment (full-time/part-time), education level and income. Chi-square values were used to test the null hypothesis that no significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and demographic characteristics of the home sewers. Due to the nature of the crosstabs tables, several of the demographic variables were recoded or collapsed to provide more meaningful categories for significance testing. Data collected on number of children in the household initially provided a wide range of family size. Few households, however, contained more than three children and as a result cells were sparsely populated within the crosstabs program. Three or more children in a household were collapsed to one category for the purpose of analysis. Data for number of children at home were handled in the same manner. Age of the youngest child ranged from 2 weeks old to 36 years. For the purpose of analysis, children were divided into pre-school and school age and older. Categories were collapsed to children five years of age and younger and over five years. In order

to be consistent with demographic variables tested in hypothesis 1c, categories used for the variables age and income were also retained. Nine demographic variables were tested individually for association with perception of home sewing. No significant associations were found between perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity and:

number of children presently living at home

age of the youngest child

age of home sewers

marital status

employment type (part-time / full-time)

education level.

Significant associations were found between perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity and:

number of children in the family

employment status

income level (Table 21).

Although the nature of the association has not been determined, some observations of the crosstabulation of perception of sewing and number of children in the household suggested that leisure activity sewers were most likely to have no children. Of home sewers in the sample who saw sewing as a combination of housework and leisure, approximately half had three or more children. The association between perception of sewing and employment status was somewhat stronger than that between perception of sewing and number of children. Leisure sewers in the sample also tended to be employed. Based on the three significant associations found, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis 2b accepted.

Hypothesis 2c:

A significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and types of items sewn.

Chi-square values were used to test the null hypothesis that no significant association

Table 21. Chi-Square Analysis of Association of Demographic Characteristics with Perception of Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure.

Demographic Characteristics	Chi-Square	d.f.	Significance
Number of Children	15.75	6	0.02*
Children at Home	9.85	6	0.13
Age of Youngest Child	1.13	2	0.57
Employment Status	16.57	2	0.00*
Part-time/Full-time Employment	2.69	2	0.26
Home Sewer's Age	10.18	8	0.62
Marital Status	12.50	6	0.05
Education	8.00	10	0.63
Income	25.48	12	0.01*

*$p < .05$.

exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and types of items sewn. The three item categories most often sewn were used, namely, pants/skirts, day dresses, blouses/shirts. Home sewers frequently constructed projects from several categories causing overlapping in the groups. For this reason chi-square values were calculated for each project category. No significant association was found between perception of sewing and construction of day dresses or of blouses/shirts. Perception of sewing and construction of pants/skirts, however, did produce a significant association and as a result the null hypothesis was rejected (Table 22). Hypothesis 2c was therefore accepted.

Table 22. Chi-Square Analysis of Association of Types of Items Sewn with Perception of Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure.

Items Sewn	Chi-Square	d.f.	Significance
Pants/Skirts	9.92	4	0.04*
Day Dresses	4.11	4	0.39
Blouses/Shirts	3.14	4	0.53

*$p < .05$.

Hypothesis 2d:

A significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and sources of home sewing education.

The three most frequently used sources of education, home economics classes in school, mothers, and self-instruction, were used in a crosstabs program. Chi-square values were used to test the null hypothesis that no significant association exists between perception of home sewing as a housework or leisure activity and sources of home sewing education. No significant associations were found between perception of sewing and any of the sewing education sources. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected based on these results.

Hypothesis 3:

A significant association exists between reasons for sewing and sources of home sewing education.

Due to the nature of the telephone interview questions regarding reasons for sewing and sources of home sewing education, chi-square tests for association were not possible for hypothesis 3. Respondents were free to provide multiple reasons for sewing as well as

any number of sources of sewing instruction. While this method provided a great deal of useful information, many respondents could not be categorized by one specific group for either of the variables involved in this hypothesis. A descriptive analysis of crosstabulations used in the case of multiple responses was appropriate in this instance. A total of 53 respondents chose home economics classes as a source of sewing education while 42 listed mothers as a source of education and an additional 26 home sewers indicated being self-taught. Eighty-three percent of home sewers who chose home economics classes as a source of education indicated sewing to economize as a reason for sewing. Another group of home sewers more likely to sew for economic reasons were those who had had part of their sewing education from their mothers. This group of sewers (taught by mothers) as well as home sewers who were self-instructed, were less likely to sew an item out of necessity because it could not be purchased. There is some evidence to suggest that home sewers who received some education in home economics classes as well as those who received some education from their mother tend to sew for economic reasons, however, only general statements may be made.

V. DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings outlined in Chapter 4 in relation to the objectives of the study and the literature reviewed. The purpose of the study was to investigate what characteristics differentiate home sewers who define sewing as a household activity from those who define it as a leisure activity.

A. General Characteristics of Home Sewers

The first objective was to assess general characteristics of home sewers in the sample. A current profile of the sample of Edmonton home sewers was developed and will be summarized here. In the majority of home sewing households in Edmonton, the female head of household was a home sewer. The second most common sewer was the male head of household followed by daughters. Female home sewers comprised 95% of the sample and the most common age group represented was 26-30 years of age. None of the home sewers in the sample was under 16 years of age. The majority of the sewers were married and approximately two-thirds of them had children. About 80% of these sewers had two or fewer children living at home. More than half of the sewers were employed, primarily part-time and in a variety of occupations. The home sewers were generally well educated and in almost half of the cases had some university education. Household income fell most frequently into the category ranging from $35,000 to $39,999 per year.

Edmonton home sewers generally had a great deal of sewing experience, with a mean of about 18 years. It was not apparent that the amount of sewing being done had changed much over the past five years. Home sewers did say, though, that the type of sewing done most frequently was mending, altering or repairing. Sewing for self or for family members was next in popularity. The sewers were most likely to indulge in sewing in the winter, and rarely ever sewed during holiday periods. Another study by McHugh (1982) found similar sewing trends. The most time spent in sewing activities according to McHugh, was in spring followed closely by winter, autumn and summer.

The majority of home sewers also preferred to sew in the evening. Friends or relatives were the most common sources consulted about sewing problems. Generally, home sewers thought that they had learned to sew from more than one source. The most frequently mentioned sources of sewing education were home economics classes in school, followed by mothers and being self-taught. College or university courses accounted for very little of home sewing education. Edmonton home sewers said they sew to economize. Enjoyment of sewing and sewing out of necessity because items could not be purchased were also important reasons.

A comparison of Edmonton home sewers to home sewers described by McHugh (1982) reveals that similar patterns occur with respect to family structure. The majority of home sewers in the McHugh study were also married and almost 50% had two or more children at home. The present study also found that about 50% of sewers had two or more children at home. The age range best represented in the present study was somewhat lower than that of the McHugh study and was also lower than the results published by *Sew News*. Employment information was closely related to that of the *Sew News* study as in each case approximately 60% of the sample was employed. Average yearly income was also consistent with results of current studies as well as being somewhat consistent with 1983 Statistics Canada family income figures ($34,080). The income range of the present study was slightly higher at $35,000 to $39,999 per year, however, data were collected in 1984 as compared to the most recent available Statistics Canada data from 1983. The most current Canadian home sewing study (McHugh, 1982) indicated that almost 70% of its sample were high school graduates. In the present study, the level of education appears to be somewhat higher as almost half of home sewers have had at least some university education. Results of the *Sew News* study were more closely related to the educational results of the present study, having had approximately 50% of sewers attend and/or graduate from college.

Reasons for sewing reported in home sewing studies throughout the years provided a guideline for current research into why people sew. Major reasons for sewing in the past have included to economize or to cut costs, to be creative, for enjoyment and to achieve better quality and fit ("Everybody's sewing like mad," 1967; Fessler, 1971; "I made it myself," 1971; Johnson, 1960; Shapiro, 1967). Although the

importance of each reason has varied somewhat over time, economy and enjoyment remain very important. More current studies have suggested that creative reasons for sewing have become more important than economic ones; however, McHugh (1982) found that three reasons for sewing were rated very important. Saving money was suggested by 52% of sewers, followed by achieving a sense of pride and obtaining better quality. The present study also lists economic reasons as important for 69% of sewers followed by enjoyment of the activity in 53% of cases and necessary-cannot purchase in 30%. Somewhat more emphasis was placed on economic reasons for sewing by home sewers in the present sample than has been the case in other sewing studies. Current economic conditions (depressed economy, unemployment) may be responsible in part for the increased awareness of saving money.

Extended Profile of Home Sewers

Additional sewing activities investigated in the present study provide some ideas about the current status of home sewing and are compared with similar investigations. Selection of projects for home sewing was done on the basis of time involved by about two-thirds of sewers. Relatively quickly completed projects and patterns were popular, however, almost half of home sewers also developed their own patterns at least sometimes. Approximately 75% of sewers designed their own clothes at least sometimes according to the 1984 *Sew News* study. A major complaint voiced by sewers (McHugh et al., 1985) was that sewing was too time consuming. Choice of quickly completed projects in the present study may be an attempt to counteract the time factor. Time saving techniques were also used at least sometimes by about two- thirds of sewers.

Specific types of projects most frequently sewn in the present study included pants/skirts, day dresses, blouses/shirts, followed by crafts and household items. Time allocated to projects by category included garments followed by home decorating items and crafts according to McHugh et al. (1985). Unfortunately, garments were not sub-divided in McHugh's study thus limiting any further comparison with the present study.

Speed of sewing in terms of fast, moderate and slow provided information in the present study regarding how sewers see themselves, and in addition approximate numbers

of projects were associated with sewing speed. Approximately 50% of the home sewers labelled themselves as moderate sewers. Within a one year period approximately half of the sample had constructed fewer than 25 projects. When cross tabulations of number of projects constructed and sewing speeds were investigated, results showed that fast home sewers generally had made more than 36 projects in the previous year, moderate sewers between 1 and 30 projects and approximately half of the slow sewers had made fewer than 20 projects. Number of projects constructed appeared to have been a consistent measure of sewing speed for the sample.

B. Home Sewing as Housework or Leisure

The second objective was to assess whether home sewing is perceived as a housework or leisure activity by home sewers. Sewers in the present study stated that they perceived home sewing to be a leisure activity in approximately 39% of cases. The same number of sewers perceived sewing to be a combination of housework and leisure; however, sewing was perceived as a household production activity by less than 10% of the sample. The remainder perceived home sewing to be a variety of activities. The 39% of home sewers who saw sewing as a combination of housework and leisure were readily able to assign a percentage weight to the housework and leisure components. The most common breakdown was 50% housework and 50% leisure. These results are interesting especially when the type of sewing undertaken most frequently, is considered. Edmonton sewers claimed that mending, altering and repair were the sewing activities most frequently undertaken. Very few sewers considered home sewing to be a housework activity; however, mending was undertaken by many sewers. Home sewing seems to have been considered something other than housework by many home sewers. A home production activity as defined by Beutler and Owen (1980) is performed by and for household members with the output having use value rather than exchange value. Mending was followed by sewing for self or for family members as the most frequently undertaken type of sewing projects. Each of these activities was performed by and for household members. Similar problems have surfaced in other studies (Murphy, 1979; Nickols & Metzen, 1978) when creative productive activities like home sewing are

encompassed by household production. Although sewing in the present study was performed primarily by and for household members, home sewers perceived their activities to be leisure rather than housework oriented.

The issue of time use in the household provided a framework for studying demographic characteristics of home sewers. The majority of the home sewers in the present study were employed at least part-time and as a result were forced to fit sewing activities into a schedule of either household work or leisure time. If home sewing were considered a household activity, studies such as Hafstrom and Schram (1983) suggested that variables including time spent in the labor force acted as a constraint on amount of time spent in household activities. Since the majority of sewers in the Edmonton study were involved in the labor force, occupation did not seem to act as a constraint on home sewing. This perhaps contributes to the explanation of why sewers did not perceive sewing to be a household activity. Time spent in the labor force was discussed in a Canadian family time use study by Douthitt (1984) and it was suggested that a trend seems to be forming for a decreased percentage of full-time employment. If this is the case, results of the present study concur as the majority of home sewers were employed part-time. The association between perception of sewing as housework or leisure and demographic variables as discussed in the findings for hypothesis 2b suggested that number of children in the household, employment status and income level were involved. Whether home sewers were employed part-time or full-time appeared to have no effect on perception of home sewing as housework or leisure. If home sewing was assumed to be leisure, Arndt, Gronmo and Hawes (1980) suggested that a negative relationship should be expected between career oriented and leisure activities due to the high opportunity cost of leisure, for employed persons. In the present study home sewers who identified sewing as a leisure activity, also tended to be employed.

Reasons for participating in household and leisure activities have been suggested throughout the literature and input was drawn from many sources when reasons for sewing were considered in the present study. In 1959, Donald and Havighurst developed some meanings for leisure including providing a sense of achievement, being creative and helping financially. These meanings were associated with manual-manipulative activities such as home sewing. In the present study, the primary

reason indicated for sewing was to save money or to economize, a leisure meaning according to Donald and Havighurst. Hypothesis 2a investigated the association between reasons for sewing and perception of sewing as housework or leisure. No associations were found between sewers who sewed to economize or sewers who sewed out of necessity and their perceptions of home sewing. There was some indication that leisure sewers may have been more likely to sew for enjoyment.

C. Satisfaction with Home Sewing

The third objective of the study was to assess the level of satisfaction with home sewing of sewers in the sample. Satisfaction experienced with household work in recent years has been found to be very low. In 1976 Ferree reported that women having paid jobs were more satisfied than full-time homemakers, and that the most satisfactory employment status was part-time, the primary occupational status found in the present study as well. The one source of satisfaction suggested to come from household production (Ferree, 1976; Reid, 1934) was production carried out in response to needs of family members, a possible explanation for the satisfaction experienced by home sewers sewing for family members. Leisure satisfaction was suggested to vary depending upon the type of leisure activity (Donald & Havighurst, 1959). In the case of sewing, a manual manipulative activity, financial help or knowing that one was saving money was thought to be a source of satisfaction. Sewing to save money was certainly important to Edmonton home sewers. Hypothesis 1a investigated level of satisfaction with sewing associated with the three most frequently mentioned reasons for sewing. Approximately 40% of economy sewers were at least satisfied with projects produced and with quality of sewing. Home sewers who sew for enjoyment were very satisfied in about 20% of cases and overall, almost 70% were at least satisfied with products and quality of sewing. Home sewers who chose necessity as a reason for sewing were also satisfied with their products although a small percentage classed themselves as very satisfied. An additional finding of the present study (hypothesis 1b) suggested that home sewers were generally satisfied and that the level of satisfaction did not change significantly among groups of home sewers based on whether they perceived sewing as

housework, leisure or a combination. The same level of satisfaction was also maintained (hypothesis 1c) regardless of varying demographic characteristics. Throughout the measures used to assess satisfaction, an overall level of satisfaction was consistent. Home sewers in Edmonton seemed satisfied with projects made, quality of their sewing, resources available to them and in general wear or use the items constructed at least sometimes.

D. Education Sources for Home Sewers

The fourth objective of the study was to assess useful education sources for home sewers. Some very useful home sewing education sources identified by Edmonton home sewers were:

Home economics classes in school

Mothers

Self-instruction

Fabric store courses.

Home sewing literature throughout the 1960s and early 1970s thought the school system to be a major source of sewing instruction ("Home sewing boom calls," 1969; Fessler, 1971; McElderry, 1965). In addition to the school system, mothers, friends and retailers' sewing courses were credited with training sewers (Fessler, 1971). Recent information has suggested that perhaps the school system is not as effective in educating home sewers as it once was. A study undertaken by Ryerson students in Toronto in 1981 reported that self-instruction was the most important source of sewing education followed by mothers, and the school system.

In the present study, home economics classes in schools appear to be educating the majority of home sewers to some extent, but because the largest group of sewers in the sample were between 26 and 30 years of age, and no responding home sewers were under 16 years of age, a statement on the amount of home sewing education provided by the school system currently cannot be made. The university clothing construction programs were not well represented in this study or in the Ryerson study of 1981. Possibly home sewers do not immediately think of a university as a place to learn to sew.

In other words, mothers and the public school system influence potential home sewers prior to university experience, and as a result, when asked where or from whom they learned to sew, home sewers reported their first home sewing influence.

Hypothesis 2d looked at associations that might exist between where home sewers learned their skills and their perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity. Sources of education appeared to have no significant bearing on how home sewers perceive sewing. Although no specific statements could be made, hypothesis 3 results suggested that a number of economy sewers had learned to sew in part through home economics classes in school. Home sewers receiving instruction from mothers were also quite likely to sew for economic reasons, among others. In light of these findings, a statement made by Werden in 1960 raises some interesting questions. The validity of college construction programs as a source of sewing education was questioned if, in fact, sewing for economic reasons was no longer valid. According to the present study economic reasons for sewing are very important to home sewers; however, college or university construction courses are not an important source of sewing education.

E. Value of Home Sewing

The fifth objective of the study was to assess the home sewer's perceived value of a home sewn item, relative to the value of the same purchased item. Household production literature has investigated ways of placing a value on activities such as sewing. When home sewers were asked to place a dollar value on their sewing time, many employed home sewers did so by assigning home sewing the same hourly value received in the labor force. A method of determining a household worker's monetary value by assessing the cost of giving up formal labor force activities to perform household tasks was studied by Glazer-Malbin (1976) and by Walker (1973). The monetary value placed on a home sewer's time is generally not included in the value assigned to an item sewn. If, for example, home sewers sew to save money or to economize, then it seems reasonable to assume that they are able to place a value on their sewing which could be compared with the value of a purchased item. When the value assigned to a home sewing project was represented by the cost of materials only, then the mean value of a

home sewn item was significantly less than the value assigned to a similar purchased item. It was on this basis that home sewers probably saw themselves as economizing. If, however, the number of hours required to complete the project and a value of sewing time in dollars per hour were included in the value of a sewing project then results showed that the home sewn item had a significantly higher mean value than the purchased equivalent.

Home sewers in the sample have indicated that home sewing represents a leisure activity or at least 50% leisure, rather than a housework activity. Hawes, Blackwell and Talarzyk (1975) defined leisure as a non-work activity but did not assume non-work to be non-productive. Home sewing, a productive activity, has been established as a leisure activity by sewers in the sample. There is perhaps no justification for placing a value on the time involved when home sewers choose to participate in sewing activities during leisure time. A non-work activity should perhaps not be subject to work or labor force values.

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate what characteristics differentiate home sewers who define home sewing as a household activity from those who define it as a leisure activity. In addition a current profile of Edmonton home sewers was developed and their level of satisfaction with home sewing was measured. Useful sources of education for home sewers were identified and the perceived value of a home sewn item was related to the value of a similar purchased item. The Home Production Activity Model was used as a basic framework for the study (Beutler & Owen, 1980).

The design of the study was a two stage survey. A total of 194 Stage I postcard questionnaires were returned, and of these 122 agreed to participate in the Stage II telephone interview. A total of 107 home sewers provided information for the entire study. Descriptive analyses were used to profile home sewers and to report on additional sewing activities. Factor analysis allowed satisfaction statements to be grouped into quality satisfaction and resource satisfaction factors. The hypotheses were tested using analysis of variance and by examining crosstabulations and chi-square values.

Although comparisons between sewers and non-sewers could not be made, a profile of home sewers was developed. Of the 181 households containing at least one home sewer, approximately one third were two person households. In approximately 76% of sewing households, one member was a home sewer. The home sewer present in the household was generally the female head of household (75%). Family size of home sewers varied and about one third of respondents had no children. An additional 25% had two children. The mean age of children belonging to home sewers in the sample was approximately 12 years of age. The modal value was five years. Females represented the majority of responding home sewers (95%) and the age range represented by 22% of the sample was 26 to 30 years of age. The majority of home

sewers were married. Almost 64% of the sample of sewers were employed, the majority on a part-time basis. Household income level ranged from $35,000 to $39,999 per year for 15% of sewers. Approximately one half of home sewers in the sample had at least some university education. Some home sewing activities were also included in the profile. Home sewers represented a range of sewing experience from 1 to 50 years with a mean of 18.5 years. No discernible pattern of change in the amount of sewing done currently as compared to five years previous was found. Home sewers did indicate that generally the type of sewing done most frequently was mending (35% of cases), followed by sewing for self (27%) or for family members in 27% of cases. The most popular times of year to indulge in sewing activities were found to be winter (37% of responses), fall (25%) and spring (22%). Evening was the preferred sewing time of 60% of home sewers. Many sewers in the sample found it necessary to consult outside sources for information about sewing. Approximately 85% consulted a friend or relative at least sometimes while books were consulted at least sometimes by 55.5% of respondents. Edmonton home sewers learned their skills from three primary sources. Home economics classes in school were chosen most frequently, followed by mothers and self-instruction. Three major reasons for sewing were also outlined. The greatest number of sewers listed sewing to economize as a reason for sewing followed by sewing for enjoyment of the activity and necessity because items could not be purchased.

No significant difference was found between sewers' satisfaction with home sewing and perception of sewing as a housework or leisure activity, nor were any differences found in sewers' satisfaction levels among any of the groups formed by demographic characteristics.

Investigation of home sewers' perception of sewing as housework or leisure and the demographic characteristics of sewers produced significant associations between perception of sewing and number of children in the household, perception of sewing and employment status and perception of sewing and income level. Specific types of items constructed by home sewers were investigated in association with home sewing as a household or leisure activity. A significant association was found between perception of home sewing as housework or leisure and the construction of pants or skirts. Source of home sewing education was not apparently associated with perception of

sewing.

Home sewers were generally quite satisfied with the products of their labor and with the quality involved. In general they perceived home sewing to be either a leisure activity (38.7%) or a combination of leisure and housework (38.7%). The most frequently occurring combination was 50% leisure and 50% housework.

B. Conclusions

The first objective, to assess general characteristics of home sewers in the sample, was accomplished by developing a current profile of the sample of sewers. Additional sewing activities were included and the profile and activities were discussed in detail in Chapters 4 and 5. Much of the demographic data collected was comparable to other relatively current Canadian studies such as the 1981 Ryerson study and McHugh, 1982. Age of home sewers, however, seemed low in comparison to other findings. Almost 65% of the present sample of sewers were 40 years of age or younger. Related to age of sewers was amount of sewing experience. Sewers in the sample had a mean of 18 years experience which was less than that of the McHugh study (1982). This is to be expected considering the difference in sample age groups represented.

The second objective was to assess whether home sewing is perceived as a housework or leisure activity by some sewers. Results of this objective were also discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. Level of satisfaction did not differ significantly among home sewers who varied in their perception of sewing. A significant association was suggested between home sewers' perception of sewing as housework or leisure and sewing for enjoyment although the nature of the association was not conclusive. Other variables significantly associated with perception of sewing as housework or leisure included number of children in the household, employment status and income level. Although the nature of the associations has not been accurately determined, the assumption that leisure sewers tended to be employed is not totally unreasonable knowing that the majority of the sample was employed, and that many respondents perceived home sewing to be a leisure activity. Much of the literature suggests that the major problem associated with home sewing is lack of time (Eggertson, 1982; McHugh, 1982). Data

collected on amount of sewing done as compared to five years previous showed no indication of a major change in sewing activities. The majority of the sample of sewers were found to be employed at least part-time and still found time to sew as a primarily leisure time activity. At a time when many researchers have reported a drop in home sewing activities, the sample of Edmonton sewers found time to continue sewing activities at the approximate level established five years previously. Perhaps home sewers with labor force commitments are beginning to re-allocate time to home sewing rather than abandoning the activity due to lack of time.

The third objective was to assess the level of satisfaction with home sewing of sewers in the sample. Results of several different methods of measuring satisfaction proved to be relatively consistent. The overall level of satifaction was found not to vary significantly among groups based on demographic characteristics or among groups based on perception of sewing as housework or leisure. Generally, satisfaction with sewing was experienced by home sewers regardless of their sources of home sewing education. Discussion of satisfaction measures occurs in Chapter 4. The measures of satisfaction were generally thought to be successful in assessing sewers' satisfaction with home sewing.

Useful sewing education sources were determined and were discussed in Chapter 4. The three major sources were consistent with findings of other home sewing studies both in Canada and in the United States.

The final objective of the study was to assess the home sewer's perceived value of a home sewn item, relative to the value of the same purchased item. This was accomplished; however, a great deal of difficulty was experienced by home sewers in placing a dollar value on their time. Employed home sewers seemed to find the task somewhat easier, although it still required some time. Significant differences were found in the means of values placed on home sewn items and purchased items. Sewing to economize seemed to be a valid reason, based on the findings.

C. Recommendations

The introduction to this study discussed the current state of home sewing according to a number of sources. References to the issues of employment and time were included. As stated in the introduction, the study investigated home sewing in Edmonton providing current information about perception of sewing, satisfaction with sewing activities, education sources for home sewers and value assigned to items sewn. The following are recommendations for future research which could have implications for educators and home sewing retailers.

Approximately 800 postcard questionnaires were not returned in Stage I of this study. A follow-up study attempting to reach these non-respondents to determine why they did not respond would provide valuable information, possibly from home sewers.

The postcard format used in Stage I of the study allowed respondents to complete and return questionnaires easily. If the present study was replicated using another sample, names as well as addresses would be useful as contact could be made with a specific person rather than a household. An increased response rate may result from the personalized contact.

In order to maintain a current profile of home sewers, the study should be repeated at regular intervals to assess changes in home sewers' attitudes and activities. Replication of the study would allow reliability of the measures to be tested.

This study was in some ways a pilot study to obtain general information about home sewers' attitudes and activities. Now that sewers have identified some current reasons for sewing and sources of education, the open ended questions utilized here could be narrowed to obtain more specific information for analysis of home sewers' activities. Future investigations into reasons for sewing and sources of home sewing education should consider replacing open ended questions with more specific ones requesting home sewers to rank reasons for sewing and education sources in order of importance.

Some valuable information was collected with regard to selection of home sewing projects and techniques. Concentration on further questionnaire development in that area would benefit home sewing marketers and retailers. Further investigation into

home sewing activities using the format of a time-use study would also benefit retailers by providing some insight into how employed home sewers cope with time constraints and what the home sewing industry could do to assist sewers.

Specific home sewing projects included in the present study were clothing, crafts and household items. Information was collected from home sewers constructing items from each category and although this was useful for a study of this nature, future projects may be more informative if clothing, crafts and household items are studied separately. Comparisons between types of home sewing projects were difficult to make in the present study. Concentration on a specific type of home sewing would allow researchers to compare characteristics of home sewers specializing in different areas of construction.

A random sample of households was used for the study in an attempt to elicit responses from men and women, sewers and non-sewers. Although some men did respond, the numbers were not great enough to allow meaningful comparisons. A similar home sewing study should be aimed at the male home sewing population. Their sewing interests, attitudes and activities may be very dissimilar to those of women sewers.

Another group of sewers identified by the present study were those who indulge in mending. A similar study could be aimed at home sewers who mend, alter or repair items to collect information about attitudes, sewing activities and satisfaction with their work.

A third group, not represented in the present study were teen-age sewers. In order to determine what impact home economics programs in the schools have on teen-age sewers, the study could be replicated using a student sample.

Direct and indirect measures of satisfaction developed for the present study provided a level of home sewing satisfaction of sewers in the study. The scores from different measures were similar; however, continued use of multiple measures of satisfaction is recommended to obtain a more accurate assessment of satisfaction. Further development of direct measures of satisfaction dealing with attitudes toward sewing and available sewing products is suggested.

In the present study, several satisfaction scores were combined after the data collection had been completed. In some cases, individual scores were not as meaningful as grouped scores for related questions. Factor analysis is one method of determining related questions. Further research into development and combination of satisfaction measures to provide a better basis for analysis is recommended.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdel-Ghany, M., & Nickols, S. Y. (1983). Husband/wife differentials in household work time: The case of dual-earner families. *Home Economics Research Journal, 12*, 159-167.

Apps, J. W. (1980). Six influences on adult education in the 1980's. *Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 3*, 4-7, 30.

Arndt, J., Gronmo, S., & Hawes, D. K. (1980). Allocation of time to leisure activities: Norwegian and American patterns. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 11*, 498-511.

Badir, D. R. (1981). Informal economy: A new economics? *Canadian Home Economics Journal, 31*, 67-70.

Baker, G. (1980). Household production: A cultural and cross-national view. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics, 4*, 71-86.

Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research, 12*, 20-44.

Bergier, M. J. (1981). A conceptual model of leisure-time choice behavior. *Journal of Leisure Research, 13*, 139-158.

Berk, S. F. (1980). *Women and household labor*. Sage Yearbooks in Women's Policy Studies Volume 5. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Beutler, I. F., & Owen, A. J. (1980). A home production activity model. *Home Economics Research Journal, 9*, 16-26.

Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples*. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Brill, E. G. (1983, September 13). Pattern firms feel squeeze. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 6.

Burney, A. (1983, Fall). New reasons for sewing. *Making It*, p. 6.

Burns, S. (1975). *The household economy: Its shape, origins and future*. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press.

Cameron, B. J. (1981). Female labour-force participation: Putting modern trends in perspective. *The Canadian Business Review, 8*(2), 30-32.

Caplovitz, D. (1981). Making ends meet: How families cope with inflation and recession. *American Academy of Political and Social Science Annals, 456*, 88-98.

Cary, J. R. (1973, April). Sewing machines: The new wonder workers. *Parent's Magazine and Better Family Living, 48*, pp. 16-17.

Chan, K. J. (1976). *The relationship of motivation for sewing, amount of sewing, perceived depersonalization of the job, and creativity.* Unpublished master's thesis, Oregon State University.

Clothing, textiles and home sewing. (1974). *Consumer's Research Magazine, 57*(10), pp. 50-59.

Cole, S., Gershuny, J., & Miles, I. (1978). Scenarios of world development. *Futures: Journal of Forecasting and Planning, 10*, 3-19.

Consumers say they sew for pleasure. (1981). *Homesewing Trade News, 22*(5), pp. 1, 14, 15.

Corbett, R. B., Fethke, C. C., & Hauserman, N. R. (1980). Achieving economic justice for homemakers. *Journal of Home Economics , 72*(2), 17-23.

Courtless, J. C. (1982). Home sewing trends. *Family Economics Review*, (4), 19-22.

Courtless, J. C. (1985). Time spent in sewing by employed women. *Family Economics Review*, (4), 1-3.

Creekmore, A. M. (1963). Clothing behaviors and their relation to general values and to the striving for basic needs. (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University) *Dissertation Abstracts International, 24*, 1599.

Curtin, R. T. (1983). Buying attitudes improve. *Economic Outlook USA, 10*, 12-16.

Donald, M. N., & Havighurst, R. J. (1959). The meanings of leisure. *Social Forces, 37*, 355-360.

Douthitt, R. (1984). Canadian family time use data: Current status and future prospects. *Canadian Home Economics Journal, 34*, 109-113.

Dyson, W. A. (1982). Canada and the informal economy - Evolving thoughts and insights. *Presented at the International Conference on the Informal Economy.* Frascati, Italy.

Eggertson, B. (1982). *Assessment of consumer orientations in clothing acquisition.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Eshelman, W. W., & Hettrick, G. P. (1965). Is it time for "a stitch in time"? *The Instructor, 74*(9), 11, 72.

Everybody's sewing like mad! (1967). *Changing Times, 21*, 41-43.

An exploratory study of women who sew in metropolitan Toronto, 1981. (1981). Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.

Family income. (1983). (Catalogue No. 13-208). Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Ferber, M. A., & Birnbaum, B. G. (1977). The "new home economics:" Retrospects and prospects. *Journal of Consumer Research, 4*, 19-28.

Ferrari, L. (1983, March/April). Time out! *Vogue Patterns*, pp. 50-51.

Ferree, M. M. (1976). Working-class jobs: Housework and paid work as sources of satisfaction. *Social Problems, 23*, 431-441.

Fessler, B. (1971). Education's role in home sewing industry. *What's New in Home Economics, 35*(4), 11-13.

Francken, D. A., & van Raaij, F. W. (1981). Satisfaction with leisure time activities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 13*, 337-351.

Friedan, B. (1981). *The second stage*. New York: Summit Books.

The future of work: A contribution to the public debate on Canada's future. (1980). *Proceedings of an International Seminar, Co-sponsored by the Vanier Institute of the Family and St. George's House*, 19-21.

Galbraith, J. K. (1973). *Economics and the public purpose*. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gardner, B. (1984, December). Pass the word - fabric stores and sewing are great fun! *Sew News*, p. 4.

Gershuny, J. I. (1979). The informal economy. *Futures: Journal of Forecasting and Planning, 11*, 3-15.

Glazer-Malbin, N. (1976). Housework. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1*, 905-922.

Hafstrom, J. L., & Dunsing, M. M. (1972). Satisfaction and education: A new approach to understanding consumption patterns. *Home Economics Research Journal, 1*, 4-13.

Hafstrom, J. L., & Schram, V. R. (1983). Housework time of wives: Pressure, facilitators, constraints. *Home Economics Research Journal, 11*, 245-255.

Havien, J. (1982, October). Making money in your home. *Chatelaine*, pp. 44, 60, 62, 64.

Hawes, D. K. (1978). Satisfactions derived from leisure-time pursuits: An exploratory nationwide survey. *Journal of Leisure Research, 10*, 247-264.

Hawes, D. K., Blackwell, R. D. & Talarzyk, W. W. (1975). Consumer satisfactions from leisure time pursuits. In M. J. Schlinger (Ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Chicago: Association for Consumer Research, *2*, 817-836.

Hawrylyshyn, O. (1978). *Estimating the value of household work in Canada 1971.* (Catalogue No. 13-566). Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 9-54.

Henderson, H. (1978). *Creating alternative futures: The end of economics.* New York: Berkley Publishing Corporation.

Henze, U. (1983). Household production - an example. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics, 7*, 287-298.

The home based cottage industry. (1983, Fall). *Making It*, pp. 20-23.

Home sewing boom calls for better teaching. (1969). *What's New in Home Economics, 33*(3), 41.

Home sewing: Textile stepchild grows up. (1972). *Textile World, 122*(6), 82.

The homesewer of the 80's: Strong-willed! Singular! Selfassured! (1984/85, Winter). *Making It*, p. 1.

Homesewers only. (1983, Fall). *Making It*, p.1.

Home-sewing booms Singer. (1948, August 14). *Business Week*, pp. 75-80.

Horn, M. J., & Gurel, L. M. (1981). *The second skin.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Huber, J. (1979). Anders arbeiten - anders wirtschaften [Social ecology and dual economy]. *Dualwirtschaft* (pp. 1-9). Frankfurt: Fisher.

Huxtable, B. (1983, September 27). Home-sewing showcase uninspiring. *Edmonton Journal*.

"I made it myself!". (1971, April 15). *Forbes, 107*, pp. 43-44.

Inefficiency - the dress mess. (1972, May 29). *Time*, p. 56.

It pays to sew. (1983). *What's New in Home Economics, 16*(5), 13.

Johnson, D. (1960). A new direction in clothing construction. *Journal of Home Economics, 52*, 572-573.

Jones, C. J. (1981). Small is powerful: Technology is art. *Futures: Journal of Forecasting and Planning, 13*, 51-62.

Jones, E., & Prescott, E. (1982). Daycare: Short or long term solution? *American Academy of Political and Social Science Annals, 461*, 91-101.

Kelly, J. R. (1980). *Leisure*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Kernaleguen, A. P. (1977). Future directions for clothing and textiles. *Canadian Home Economics Journal, 27*, 9-16.

Knapp, B. J., & Winakor, G. (1979). Clothing construction: Use of quick techniques related to homemakers' allocation of time (Summary). *Combined Proceedings of the 1979 Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing Regional Meetings*, 100.

Kneeland, H. (1929). Women's economic contribution in the home. *American Academy of Political and Social Science Annals, 143*, 33-40.

Kohlmann, L. (1962). Personal values what are they? *Journal of Home Economics, 54*, 819-822.

Koontz, P. M. (1981). Home sewing by adolescents: Variables affecting the amount of sewing and the decision to continue sewing (Summary). *Combined Proceedings of the 1981 Association of College Professors of Textiles and Clothing Regional Meetings*, 166.

Kreps, B. (1982). Simplicity as a key to freedom. *Enroute*, 42, 72, 76.

Lowe, E. D. (1979). *Determinants of homemaker's satisfaction with clothing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

Lowe, E. D., & Dunsing, M. M. (1981). Clothing satisfaction determinants. *Home Economics Research Journal, 9*, 363-373.

Maslow, A. H. (Ed.). (1959). *New knowledge in human values*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality (2nd ed.)*. New York: Harper and Row.

McElderry, B. J. (1965). Clothing construction and other sewing practices of college graduates. *Journal of Home Economics, 57*, 730-731.

McHugh, A. M. (1982). *An analysis of time allocation to home-sewing*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Guelph.

McHugh, A. M., Wall, M. J., & Frisbee, W. R. (1985). Factors influencing time allocation to home sewing. *Canadian Home Economics Journal, 35*, 151-156.

Member reports sewing decline. (1983, Winter). *Omicron Nu Newsletter*.

Murphy, M. (1979). The measurement and valuation of non market economic activities. In C. Hefferan (Ed.), *The Household as Producer - A look beyond the market*. Proceedings of a workshop sponsored by the American Home Economics Association. St. Charles, Missouri.

Nickols, S. Y., & Abdel-Ghany, M. (1983). Leisure time of husbands and wives. *Home Economics Research Journal, 12*, 189-198.

Nickols, S. Y., & Metzen, E. J. (1978). Housework time of husband and wife. *Home Economics Research Journal, 7*, 85-97.

Oliver, R. (1981). What is customer satisfaction? *Wharton Magazine, 5*, pp. 36-41.

Outlook on the 80's. (1981, September). *Home Sewing Trade News*, pp. 1, 20.

Owen, A. J., & Beutler, I. F. (1981). Household production and market employment: Dual avenues of consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics, 5*, 157-174.

Pederson, K. W. (1972). *Clothing construction behaviors related to experiences, skills and interests of seventy non-home economics undergraduate female students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Texas Tech University.

Perry, M. O., Schultz, H. G., & Rucker, M. H. (1983). Clothing interest, self-actualization, and demographic variables. *Home Economics Research Journal, 11*, 280-287.

Pierce, R. C. (1980). Dimensions of leisure. I: Satisfactions. *Journal of Leisure Research, 12*, 5-19.

Proulx, M. (1978, June). Women and work. *Advisory Council on the Status of Women*.

Psychology today. (1970). Del Mar California: C R M Books.

Quilling, J. A. (1982). The challenges of a post-industrial society. *Journal of Home Economics, 74*(2), 21-22.

Reid, M. (1934). *Economics of household production*. London: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Reid, P. M. (1980). From bays to peninsulas: Settlement and transportation patterns in Newfoundland. (Background material for a study on Newfoundland economy - Published by Economic Council of Canada).

Report from the home sewing front. (1973, Spring/Summer). *American Fabrics and Fashions*, pp. 55-58.

Reshaping the welfare state. (1982). *Proceedings of a VIF Seminar held at Couchiching Conference Centre, Geneva Park, Ontario.*

Robertson, J. (1976). *Power, money and sex*. London: Marion Boyars.

Robertson, J. (1977). "Seeing our economy whole: Satisfying personal, familial and community needs". Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta, *The Max Bell Lecture*.

Rockwell, L. A. T. (1974). *Home sewing practices of homemakers of West Whitman County, Washington.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Idaho.

Roman, M. (1983, September 13). Unraveling Simplicity's tender offer history. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 35

Ross, D., & Usher, P. (1983). The informal economy: Has public policy neglected it? *Transition, 13*(1), 9-12.

Ryan, M. S. (1954). A study of factors in the selection and care of blouses which relate to consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Home Economics, 46*, 145-154.

Sanford, E. M. (1960). *The study of the influences affecting the selection of clothing for freshmen wardrobes by home economics students at a Canadian college.* Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University.

Schnittgrund, K. P. (1980). Productive time of household heads. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics, 4*, 239-248.

Schumacher, H. (1979). *Small is beautiful*. London: Harper & Row.

Scott Wallach, J. (1982). The mechanization of women's work. *Scientific American, 247*(3), pp. 167-185.

Seeing our whole economy: Families and communities as the economic foundation of the economy. (1976). *Public Statement by the Vanier Institute of the Family*. Ottawa, Ontario

Sew and reap. (1958, November). *Time*, pp. 70-72.

Sewing by satellite II. (1983, November). Video Teleconference sponsored by American Home Sewing Association.

Shapiro, J. J. (1967, May 1). Patterns of culture. *Forbes, 99*, pp.70-71.

Shivers, J. (1981). Undergraduate home economics perspectives. *Proceedings of 1981 Conference of Canadian University Teachers of Home Economics*, 19-30.

Signet Research. (1984). *Home sewing in 1984: A Sew News market study*. Cliffside Park, N. J.: Author.

Smith, A. (1981). The informal economy. *Lloyds Bank Review, 141*, 45-60.

Smith, J. A. (1983). The homemaker/entrepreneur: A direction with potential. *Forum, 43*(1), 4-5.

Smith, J., & Reilly, M. (1983, February). "Sewing for profit". *American Home Economics Association Action*.

Spanovich, M. A. (1982). *Satisfaction with home sewing products and services among patrons of three types of retail fabric stores*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University.

Spiller, J. L. (1981). *Retired women's concepts of leisure*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Stafford, K. (1983). The effects of wife's employment time on her household work time. *Home Economics Research Journal, 11*, 257-266.

Stevens, E. (1983, August 31). Sewing co-op creates jobs, and quality. *Toronto Globe and Mail*.

Turner, R. G. (1985). Textile printing: The changing scene. *Textile Chemist and Colorist, 17*(3), 33-34.

Usher, P. (1981). Canada's north - Two economies, two ways of life. *Transition, 11*(3), 7-11.

Vanek, J. (1974). Time spent in housework. *Scientific American, 231*(5), pp. 116-120.

Video sewing hits its stride. (1983, Summer). *Canadian Home Sewing and Needlecraft Association.*

Volker, C. B., Winter, M., & Beutler, I. F. (1983). Household production of food: Expenditures, norms, and satisfaction. *Home Economics Research Journal, 11,* 267-279.

Voss, J. L., & Blackwell, R. D. (1975). Markets for leisure time. In M. J. Schlinger (Ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research 2,* (pp.837-845). Chicago: Association for Consumer Research.

Walker, K. E. (1973). Household worktime: Its implication for family decisions. *Journal of Home Economics, 65* (7), 7-11.

Walker, N. P. (1968). Clothing expenditures as related to selected values, self-actualization, and buying practices. (Doctoral dissertation, Pennysylvania State University) *Dissertation Abstracts International, 29,* 4836B.

Wall, M. (1974). Consumer satisfaction with clothing wear and care performance and consumer communication of clothing performance complaints. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) *Dissertation Abstracts International, 35,* 2297B.

Wall, M., Dickey, L. E., & Talarzyk, W. W. (1978). Correlates of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with clothing performance. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 12,* 104-115.

Werden, J. (1960). The place of clothing construction in the college program. *Journal of Home Economics, 52,* 340-341.

Young, E. (1982). The informal economy. *Lloyds Bank Review, 143,* 61-62.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Stage I Postcard Questionnaire

805

To be completed by ONE of the householders

1. a. How many people are in your household? ____
   b. How many sew or mend? ____
   c. Who does the sewing or mending?
   ____ 1. male head of household ____ 4. son(s)
   ____ 2. female head of household ____ 5. roommate(s)
   ____ 3. daughter(s) ____ 6. other (specify) ____

2. a. How many children do you have? ____
   b. How many children live at home with you? ____
   c. What is the age of your youngest child? ____ years

Please have one of the home sewers in your household complete the remaining questions. If there is no one who sews, please return the postcard after completing the first two parts. Thank you for your cooperation.

3. Sex: ____ 1. Female ____ 2. Male

4. In what age category are you?
   ____ 1. under 16 years ____ 5. 31-35 years ____ 9. 51-55 years
   ____ 2. 16-20 years ____ 6. 36-40 years ____ 10. 56-60 years
   ____ 3. 21-25 years ____ 7. 41-45 years ____ 11. 61-65 years
   ____ 4. 26-30 years ____ 8. 46-50 years ____ 12. over 65 years

5. What is your marital status?
   ____ 1. single ____ 2. married
   ____ 3. widowed ____ 4. divorced
   ____ 5. other (please specify) ____

6. a. Are you employed outside your home? ____ Yes ____ No
   b. If yes, are you employed ____ full-time or ____ part-time
   Number of hours per week ____

7. If you are employed outside your home, what is your occupation? ____

8. What is your highest level of education?
   ____ 1. some or all elementary education
   ____ 2. some or all high school
   ____ 3. some trade or technical school
   ____ 4. trade or technical school diploma
   ____ 5. some college or university
   ____ 6. university degree(s)

9. Would you be willing to participate in providing further information about your home sewing activities?
   ____ yes ____ no

   If yes, please provide your name and telephone number so that we can contact you to make arrangements for a telephone interview. A telephone interview will take about 20 minutes.

   Name ____

   Telephone number ____

   What is the best time of day to call you?
   ____ morning ____ afternoon ____ evening

Please return completed postcard by April 2, 1984.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

Covering Letter

FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA · EDMONTON CANADA · T6G 2M8
403 · 432·3824

March 13, 1984

Dear Householder:

In the Department of Clothing and Textiles at the University of Alberta we are studying current trends in home sewing. Your household is one of 1000 in Edmonton selected to provide input about what is happening in home sewing. We would like someone in your household to complete the enclosed postcard and return it to us. Your participation in this portion of our study is totally voluntary and all information provided will remain completely confidential.

To let you know what we consider home sewing to be, we have defined it as follows: a non-paid activity, carried out in the home, using either a sewing machine or handwork techniques to construct or repair clothing, household textile products or craft items. Included in this definition are alterations, mending, patching, and restyling of either home sewn or purchased items, in addition to regular sewing activities.

Please take time to answer the questions on the postcard. By doing this you will greatly assist us in compiling the information necessary for our study. If you return the completed postcard by April 2, 1984, you will have a chance to win one of several prizes. First prize will be $25 and second prize will be $10. Five additional prizes of a pair of scissors and a book entitled "Behind the Seams" which have been contributed by Pfaff Canada, Inc. will also be awarded.

Respondents who agree to participate in the telephone interview will also be eligible for other prizes to be announced at the time of the telephone interview.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Nelma Fetterman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Diane Blenkarn
Research Assistant

encl.

APPENDIX C

Stage II Telephone Interview

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVIEWERS

In preparation for the interview, ensure that the following supplies are available:

- an interview schedule with the id no. recorded on each page
- at least two sharp pencils
- an eraser
- calendar for May and June
- coding instructions
- computer coding sheets

Please follow the wording of the questionnaire as closely as possible.

Make notes of comments or places where clarification was needed. The last page of the interview schedule is blank so that there is plenty of room for recording comments. Comments will be very helpful in supplementing the information gained from the interview.

Record data on coding sheets as soon as the interview is completed.

Once the coding has been completed place the interview schedule in a brown envelope and store in a safe place where no one else has access.

ID no. _____

Telephone Number _____

FIRST CONTACT

May I speak to _____?

This is Carol Pecush calling on behalf of Dr. Fetterman from the University of Alberta regarding the home sewing survey.

Is this a convenient time for you to give us more information or would you prefer that I call back at another time?

_____ yes, this is a good time for me

If so, go to page 2.

_____ no, please call again on May _____, _____day,

at _____ AM PM

Thank you.
I look forward to talking to you on _____.

SECOND CONTACT

May I speak to _____?

This is _____ calling back about the home sewing information.

Go to page 2.

Was this person a winner of one of our incentive awards?

no _____ yes _____ Which one?

$25 _____
$10 _____
book and scissors _____

ID no. _____

Thank you for agreeing to provide us with more details about your home sewing activities. You are one of 125 Edmontonians who will be helping us discover what is going on in the area of home sewing.

When we have finished all of the interviews we will again be awarding prizes to some of the participants. This time we will be drawing for three prizes - first prize will be $50, second prize will be $25 and third prize will be $10. You will be eligible for one of these prizes because you have participated in our interviews.

Let's go to the interview now.

Please keep in mind that the information which you provide will remain confidential. If there are questions which you do not wish to answer, please indicate this.
The interview will take about 20 minutes but if you wish to stop before then please let me know.

CARD-COLUMNS

1. What priority would you place on sewing in relation to your other household tasks?
   _____ high (3) _____ average (2) _____ low (1) 1 - 41

2. For how many years have you been sewing? _____ years 1 - 42-43

3. Compared with five years ago, do you do more sewing, less sewing, or about the same amount of sewing?
   _____ more (3) _____ same (2) _____ less (1) 1 - 44

4. What one type of sewing do you do most frequently? 1 - 45
   _____ a. for self*
   _____ b. for family*
   _____ c. for friends
   _____ d. for pay
   _____ e. household items*
   _____ f. mending, alterations, repairs*
   _____ g. other

   *If the respondent answers a, b, e, or f, Question 5 will be asked.

5. On the average, how often were the products of your home sewing activities worn or used within the last year?
   _____ frequently (2) _____ sometimes (1) _____ never (0) 1 - 46

6. Were all the items you sewed in the past year completed?
   _____ yes (1) _____ no (0) 1 - 47

7. a. How frequently do you mend, repair, or alter clothing items or household textile products?
   _____ frequently (2) _____ sometimes (1) _____ never (0) 1 - 48

   b. If the respondent answered "frequently" or "sometimes" to a, ask:

      i. How many hours per week do you spend mending, repairing, or altering clothing or other household textile products? _____ hours 1 - 49-52

      ii. What priority would you place on mending, repairing, or altering clothing or other household textile products in relation to your other household tasks?
      _____ high (3) _____ average (2) _____ low (1) 1 - 53

8. Is any of your mending, repairing, or altering of clothing or household textile products performed by people outside your home?
   _____ frequently (0) _____ sometimes (1) _____ never (2) 1 - 54

9. Do you undertake sewing projects more at certain times of the year than at other times?

_____ yes (1) _____ no (2) 1 - 55

If the answer to Question 9 is "yes," then Question 10 will be asked.

10. What time(s) of the year do you do your sewing?

spring (March to May)	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 56
summer (June to August)	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 57
fall (September to November)	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 58
winter (December to February	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 59
holidays or vacations	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 60

11. What time(s) during the day do you undertake your sewing or mending projects?

morning (6:00 am to noon)	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 61
afternoon (noon to 6:00 pm)	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 62
evening (6:00 pm to 11:00 pm)	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 63
night (11:00 pm to 6:00 am)	___ yes (1)	___ no (2)	1 - 64

12. Do you consider yourself a fast, moderate, or slow sewer?

___ fast (0) ___ moderate (1) ___ slow (2) 1 - 65

13. Do you purposely select projects which will not take a great amount of time to complete?

___ frequently (0) ___ sometimes (1) ___ never (2) 1 - 66

14. Do you select "Fast & Easy," "Sew 'n Sew," etc., patterns?

___ frequently (0) ___ sometimes (1) ___ never (2) 1 - 67

15. Do you select patterns which require more detail such as patterns with bound pockets, special inserts, or pin tucks?

___ frequently (2) ___ sometimes (1) ___ never (0) 1 - 68

16. Do you develop your own patterns?

___ frequently (2) ___ sometimes (1) ___ never (0) 1 - 69

17. Considering the majority of articles you have sewn in the past year, did you have to make any special considerations for working with the fabrics (e.g., preshrinking, layout, cutting, sewing techniques, pressing, etc.)?

___ frequently (2) ___ sometimes (1) ___ never (0) 1 - 70

18. Do you ever try to decrease the time involved in the sewing process by using machine rather than hand-sewn hems, eliminating pockets, applying purchased ruffles instead of making the ruffles, etc.?

___ frequently (0) ___ sometimes (1) ___ never (2) 1 - 71

blank 1 - 72

19. a. When you sew garments for yourself or other family members, do you have to make alterations to the purchased patterns?
____ frequently (2) ____ sometimes (1) ____ never (0) 1 - 73

b. If so, what particular alterations do you make? Check all those made.

	yes (1)	no (0)	
length	____		1 - 74
hips	____		1 - 75
waist	____		1 - 76
bust	____		1 - 77
shoulders	____		1 - 78
arms	____		1 - 79
other	____	(specify)_____	1 - 80

_____

20. Do you ever consult any outside sources for information on how to sew with fabrics you have selected for your sewing?
____ yes (1) ____ no (2) 2 - 9

If "yes," continue to Question 21. If "no," go to Question 22.

21. Who were the sources you consulted?

1. salesclerk	____ frequently (2)	____ sometimes (1)	____ (0)	2 - 10
2. home economist	____ frequently (2)	____ sometimes (1)	____ (0)	2 - 11
3. sewing instructor	____ frequently (2)	____ sometimes (1)	____ (0)	2 - 12
4. friend or relative	____ frequently (2)	____ sometimes (1)	____ (0)	2 - 13
5. books	____ frequently (2)	____ sometimes (1)	____ (0)	2 - 14

22. Where or from whom did you learn to sew? Record all responses.

	yes (1) or no (2)	
1. mother	____	2 - 15
2. self-taught	____	2 - 16
3. friends or relatives	____	2 - 17
4. home economics classes in school	____	2 - 18
5. evening or continuing education courses	____	2 - 19
6. college or university clothing courses	____	2 - 20
7. 4-H or other organized clubs	____	2 - 21
8. courses offered by sewing machine companies	____	2 - 22
9. information or courses offered by district home economists	____	2 - 23
10. courses offered by fabric stores	____	2 - 24
11. books on sewing	____	2 - 25
12. pattern instructions	____	2 - 26
13. TV sewing programs	____	2 - 27
14. other	____	2 - 28

specify _____

TOTAL _____ 2 - 29-30

The following questions relate to what kinds of items you sew and how often you wear with what you have made. You can be quite general in your responses by saying "frequently," "sometimes," or "never."

blank 2 - 31-35

23.

	How often do you sew the following items? F (2)	S (1)	N (0)	How many of each of the following have you sewn in the past year?	How often do you wear or use items you have sewn? F (2)	S (1)	N (0)	How satisfied are you with the quality of items you have sewn? Categories: 1. very dissatisfied 2. dissatisfied 3. neutral 4. satisfied 5. very satisfied	
Blouses/shirts								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 36-40
Pants/skirts								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 41-45
Day dresses								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 46-50
Evening wear								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 51-55
Suits/coats/jackets								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 56-60
Crafts								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 61-65
Toys								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 66-70
Household items								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 71-75
Children's clothing								1 2 3 4 5	2 - 76-80
Lingerie/sleepwear								1 2 3 4 5	3 - 11-15
Leisure or sports clothes (fitness and swimwear)								1 2 3 4 5	3 - 16-20
Upholstery								1 2 3 4 5	3 - 21-25
Draperies								1 2 3 4 5	3 - 26-30
Other								1 2 3 4 5	3 - 31-35

Total _____ 3 - 36-38

F = frequently S= sometimes N = never

blank 3 - 39-40

24. a. Please state your most recent home sewing project and estimate the number of hours it took to complete it.

Project: _____ Hours: _____ 3 - 41-43 3 - 44-48

b. Please estimate the value of your sewing time per hour in dollars.

Estimated value: $_____ 3 - 49-52

c. Please estimate the cost of materials used in your last sewing project.

Cost: $_____ 3 - 53-57

d. Would it be possible to purchase a similar item? ___ yes(1) ___ no(2) 3 - 58

If "yes," what would you estimate the retail price of the item to be?

Retail price: $_____ 3 - 59-63

blank 3 - 64-65

25. For the following statements I would like to know your level of satisfaction with certain aspects of your home sewing. Think of your satisfaction on a five-point scale from very dissatisfied to dissatisfied to neutral to satisfied and very satisfied.

Just indicate how satisfied you are with the following:

1 = very dissatisfied
2 = dissatisfied
3 = neutral
4 = satisfied
5 = very satisfied

a. Your home sewing in general.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 66
b. Patterns available to the home sewer.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 67
c. The variety of fabrics and notions available to the home sewer.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 68
d. Sewing information available to the home sewer.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 69
e. Convenient and time saving products available to home sewers (modern sewing equipment, fusible interfacings, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 70
f. The professional look of a garment, craft item, or household textile you have sewn.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 71
g. Your ability to make a quality home sewn item.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 72
h. The wear- or use-life of a home sewing project.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 73
i. The fit of garments sewn at home.	1 2 3 4 5	3 - 74

26. Please state the reasons why you sew. yes(1) no(2)

Note to interviewer: Do not read this list to the interviewee.
Check which responses the interviewee gives.

_____	1. to relax	4 - 11
_____	2. as a creative outlet	4 - 12
_____	3. to develop a skill	4 - 13
_____	4. to obtain original items	4 - 14
_____	5. to fill spare time	4 - 15
_____	6. I consider it a challenge	4 - 16
_____	7. sewing is a form of self-expression	4 - 17
_____	8. enjoyment of the activity	4 - 18
_____	9. to provide for family members	4 - 19
_____	10. to repair, maintain, or alter clothing, crafts, or household items	4 - 20
_____	11. to economize (save money)	4 - 21
_____	12. to obtain better fitting clothing	4 - 22
_____	13. sewing is necessary to obtain items which I cannot purchase	4 - 23
_____	14. in order to get better quality	4 - 24
_____	15. to increase the size of my wardrobe	4 - 25
_____	16. it provides a sense of achievement or accomplishment	4 - 26
_____	17. other _____	4 - 27
_____	18. other _____	4 - 28
_____	19. other _____	4 - 29
_____	20. other _____	4 - 30
	blank	4 - 31-32

27. Considering the sewing that you do, would you say that it represents (1) a leisure activity, (2) housework, (3) a combination of leisure and housework, or (4) something else? 4 - 33

_____

28. If sewing is a combination of housework and leisure activity, what percent is

a. housework _____ % 4 - 34-35
b. leisure _____ % 4 - 36-37
c. other _____ % 4 - 38-39

The following question is the last one regarding the description of home sewers.

29. To complete our picture of who the home sewers in Edmonton are, we would like to have a general picture of the income level of your household. Would you be able to give me an estimate of your yearly family income before taxes? If so, what is your estimate? If you could give it within a range of $5000 that would be helpful. For example, $20,000 to $25,000.

4 - 40-41

_____ 1. under $9999	_____ 5. $25000 - $29999	_____ 9. $45000 - $49999
_____ 2. $10000 - $14999	_____ 6. $30000 - $34999	_____ 10. $50000 - $54999
_____ 3. $15000 - $19999	_____ 7. $35000 - $39999	_____ 11. $55000 - $59999
_____ 4. $20000 - $24999	_____ 8. $40000 - $44999	_____ 12. $60000 and over

Thank you for your participation.

Do you have any comments you would like to make regarding the interview?
___ yes(1) ___ no(2) 4 - 42

Note to interviewer: Did the interviewee say she would like to know the results of our study?
____ yes(1) ____ no(2) 4 - 43

This is the first stage of our investigation of home sewing activities. We hope to study in more detail the sources of education which home sewers have found useful. If we are able to continue our investigation at a later date, would you be willing to talk to us again?

____ yes(1) ____ no(2) 4 - 44

Note to interviewer: Please record any relevant comments which would be useful in interpreting the responses given by the interviewee. Please use the blank page attached for these comments.